SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

Stebbing. Discourses upon Several Subjects. 1733

Stebbing. Essay on Civil Government in relation to Religion. 1744

Whiston. Eternity of Hell-torments considered. 1745

Anon. Miserable and Distracted State of Religion on the Downfall of the Church Establishment. (i.e. at the Rebellion.) 1746

I. 3

DISCOURSES

UPON

Several SUBJECTS;

VIZ.

REGENERATION, *or the* NEW BIRTH; *In Two Parts.*

JUSTIFYING *or* SAVING FAITH.

GOSPEL HOLINESS, *or* SANCTIFICATION.

FERVENCY *in* Prayer, *and the Assistance of the Spirit in relation to it.*

INTENDED

As a SUPPLEMENT to the *Abridgement* of Dr. CLAGET's Discourse concerning *The Operations of the* Holy Spirit.

By HENRY STEBBING, *M. A.*
Rector of Rickinghall *in* Suffolk, *and late Fellow of S.* Katherine's Hall, *in* Cambridge.

LONDON:
Printed for JONAH BOWYER, at the *Rose* in St. *Paul's Church-Yard.* 1722.

3.030.239

Ac911.1722.S74

To His Grace

WILLIAM

Lord Arch-Bishop of

CANTERBURY.

May it Please Your Grace,

YOUR Grace's Favourable Reception of Part of this Work publiſhed ſome time ago, hath embolden'd me to put the Whole under Your *Protection.* The Subject here under Con-

ſideration, is of the greateſt Importance to Religion. To know that we are under the Influence of *God*'s *Holy Spirit*, is not only in It-ſelf One Great Motive to True Piety, but is that which gives Life and Vigor to all the Reſt. When this Great Article is cleared from the Corruptions of *Enthuſiaſm* on the one ſide, and from the Contempts of *Infidelity* on the other, we ſhall find it to be the beſt Foundation of a *Reaſonable Service* to God. This, my LORD, is the Truth

I would promote in the following Papers; and by placing Your GRACE's Name in the Front of them, the Doctrine will come recommended to the World by Example as well as Precept; and Men may learn, That Natural Reason and Understanding are never in greater Perfection, than when they are improved by the Grace of the Gospel, and that the Spirit which we have received, is, to use the Words of St. *Paul*, The *Spirit of a Sound Mind.*

The Dedication.

YOUR GRACE's long Acquaintance with the late Excellent Dr. *CLAGET*, and Your great and juſt Eſteem for him, make it unneceſſary for me to ſay any thing of this Work, as far as it is His. My own Part in it, may, I am ſenſible, ſtand in need of many favourable Allowances; and yet it comes with ſome Confidence to Your GRACE, relying on this Experienced Truth, That the moſt Polite and Juſt Writers, who have no Reaſon to fear the ſevereſt Judges, are al-

always themſelves the tendereſt, and moſt ready to overlook the Imperfections of others. I am,

My LORD,

Your GRACE's *moſt Dutiful*

and moſt Obedient Son

and Servant,

HENRY STEBBING.

THE PREFACE.

IN *Performance of my Promiſe, I now offer to the Publick, the enſuing Tracts, which thro' the Affinity of the Subject, I thought neceſſary towards making the Treatiſe concerning the* Operations *of the* Holy Spirit, *compleat. I have nothing to acquaint the Reader with, but this; That the firſt Part of the Diſcourſe concerning* Regeneration, *and that concerning* Goſpel-Holineſs, *are the only Pieces in which I have had any Help from Dr.* Claget. *The reſt I muſt be anſwerable for my-ſelf; tho' I ought not ſo far to claim* that *concerning* Juſti-

Juſtification, *as my own, as not to acknowledge my-ſelf greatly indebted to the late Learned and Excellent Biſhop* Bull, *whoſe Notion I have mainly followed. I now ſubmit the Whole to the* Reader's *Judgment; and if what I have done may be of any Uſe to Young Beginners, towards leading them, by a ſhort and eaſy Way, to judge rightly of ſome* important *and (as they have been* made*) not leſs* difficult *Points in Divinity, I ſhall think my Time and Pains well beſtowed.*

THE CONTENTS.

DISCOURSE I.

Concerning REGENERATION, or the NEW-BIRTH.

PART I.

§. I. TO be Regenerate a neceſſary Qualification for Eternal Life, p. 1. §. II. This Phraſe not to be underſtood literally and properly, p. 2. §. III. It ſignifies in general to be a ſincere Diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt, p. 3. §. IV. To be a ſincere Diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt, conſiſts, 1ſt. In being baptized as our Saviour requires; and, 2dly. In making good the Profeſſion of Baptiſm, which is to believe in Chriſt, and obey his Commandments, p. 4. §. V. A general Obſervation to prove, that this is all that is meant by being Regenerate, p. 6.

p. 6. §. VI. *This Notion particularly confirmed from* John iii. 3, 5. p. 7. §. VII. *What is meant by being born of Water*, ibid. §. VIII. *And what of being born of the Spirit*, p. 9. §. IX. *The Word Regeneration sometimes used in a more confined Sense*, p. 11. §. X. *The Reasons why the Word Regeneration is used to denote our being the sincere Disciples of Jesus Christ*, p. 14. §. XI. *The same Point further pursued*, p. 17. §. XII. *Concerning other Metaphors whereby the same thing is expressed*, p. 18. §. XIII. *This Account confirmed by the whole Scope of our Saviour's Discourse with* Nicodemus, John iii. p. 19. §. XIV. *Our Saviour's Discourse with* Nicodemus *paraphrased*, p. 22. §. XV. *The Conclusion*, p. 27.

DISCOURSE I.

Concerning REGENERATION or the NEW-BIRTH.

PART II.

§. I. *WHAT it is to be Regenerate in the Notion of some Modern Divines*, p. 29. §. II. *What is meant by supernatural Habits*, p. 31. §. III. *Deliberate Sin not consistent with a Regenerate State*, p. 36. §. IV. *Dr.*

Dr. Whitby's *Reasoning upon this Point examined and refuted*, p. 39. §. V. *Deliberate Sin inconsistent with a Regenerate State according to St.* John, p. 45. §. VI. *The same Point proved from other Passages of Scripture*, p. 50. §. VII. *No Man is in a Regenerate State, who is not willing to part with All for the sake of Christ*, p. 54. *A Caution upon this Head*, p. 55. §. VIII. *The Opinion that a Man may live conformably to all the Laws of Christ, and yet be unregenerate, refuted*, p. 60. §. IX. *The Notion of Infused Habits refuted*, p. 64. §. X. *This Notion has no Foundation in Scripture; it tends to discourage Piety*, p. 70.

DISCOURSE II.

Of *Saving* or *Justifying Faith.*

§. I. *HOW this Question comes to be attended with any Difficulty*, p. 73. §. II. *What is meant by being justified*, p. 75. §. III. *Two Preliminaries laid down for the clearing of this Point*, p. 78. §. IV. *The Faith to which St.* Paul *ascribes Justification, includes the Completion of the whole Evangelical Law*, p. 80. §. V. *An Objection answered*, p. 81. §. VI. *This Point made good from St.* Paul's *Interpretation of his own Meaning*, ibid. §. VII. *And from other Passages of Scripture*, p. 87. §. VIII. *This Point evident from the Necessity of*

of Obedience to qualify us for Eternal Life. An Objection answered, p. 89. §. IX. *What is meant by a Condition of Salvation*, p. 92. §. X. *This Point farther argued from God's proceeding at the Day of Judgment*, p. 93. §. XI. *And from the tacit Confession of those who contradict it*, p. 94. §. XII. *The Reason why the Completion of the whole Law is expressed by the Word* Faith, p. 96. §. XIII. *An Answer to an Objection*, p. 97. §. XIV. *What that is to which the Apostle ascribes Justification under the Name of Works*, p. 99. *Two Questions propounded for the clearing this Difficulty*, p. 100. §. XV. *A Paraphrase of the Four first Chapters to the* Romans, p. 101. §. XVI. *The Law whose Works the Apostle excludes from Justification, is the* Jewish *Law, both Moral and Ceremonial*, p. 115. §. XVII. *The Works of the Law are excluded from Justification no otherwise than consider'd as abstracted from Evangelical Grace*, p. 117. §. XVII. *Two Errors of the* Jews *principally struck at*, p. 118. §. XIX. *This Point concluded, and shewn to be agreeable to the Doctrine of St.* James, p. 121. §. XX. *No other way of reconciling these two Apostles, if this be not admitted of. Some other Methods examined, and shewn to be insufficient*, p. 123. §. XXI. *The Method of explaining this Point made use of by Foreign Divines, obscure and unintelligible*, p. 125. §. XXII. *What is the true Difference between that Faith which justifies, and that which doth not justify*, p. 128. *A Conclusion from hence against some Enthusiasts*, p. 129.

DIS-

DISCOURSE III.

Of Gospel Holiness; *or* Sanctification.

§. I. *'TIS not hard to understand what Holiness is*, p. 133. §. II. *Its general Notion laid down*, p. 134. *Two ways by which the Notion of it hath been corrupted*, p. 135. §. III. *Whether Holiness must be the Fruit of electing Love*, p. 135. §. IV. *Whether it be an infused Habit*, p. 137. §. V. *Whether Holiness differs from Moral Vertue*, p. 140. *Moral Vertue what*, ibid. §. VI. *This Notion compared with the Notion of Holiness*, p. 142. §. VII. *Objections answered*, p. 143. §. VIII. *A false Notion of Moral Vertue*, p. 146. *And of Christian Obedience*, p. 147.

DISCOURSE IV.

Of *Fervency* in *Prayer*, and of the Work of the Spirit in Relation to it.

§. I. *THE Question stated*, p. 149. *Three Things propounded towards the Resolution of it*, p. 150. §. II. *What it is to pray fervently*,

ly, p. 150. §. III. *Whether Fervency be neceſſary to render our Prayers effectual*, p. 152. §. IV. *What Degree of it will be ſufficient. It is ſhewn that no higher Degree of Fervency is neceſſary to render our Prayers acceptable, than what is natural to the Ordinary Temper and Diſpoſition of a good Man*, p. 155. *Yet greater Earneſtneſs contributes to the greater Perfection of Devotion*, p. 157. §. V. *With what Degree of Earneſtneſs a Man ought ordinarily to deſire the Supply of his Needs. A Diſtinction in this caſe between Temporal Things and Spiritual; and between ſuch Spiritual Things as are neceſſary, and ſuch as are only profitable. Such a Degree of Earneſtneſs as is ſufficient to lead us to Obedience, as much as is ordinarily and neceſſarily required*, p. 158. §. VI. *An Inference from theſe Premiſes determining the Degrees of Earneſtneſs with which it will be ſufficient for us to pray*, p. 161. §. VII. *How far it is reaſonable to believe, that the Spirit excites us to Fervency in Devotion by any Act or Operation diſtinct from that Influence which he vouchſafes us in the Ordinary Courſe of our Lives*, p. 163.

DIS-

DISCOURSE I.

Concerning REGENERATION,

OR,

The NEW BIRTH.

PART I.

Wherein is ſhewn, What the SCRIPTURE *means by being* REGENERATE.

§. I. "THAT we are *Regenerated* by the "Operations of the Holy Spirit;" and that it is neceſſary that we ſhould be ſo, in order to our being qualified for the Kingdom of Heaven; is a Thing not to be doubted of among Chriſtians. "For our Saviour ſaith, That *except* "*a Man be* BORN AGAIN, (or ‖*from Above*) *he* "*cannot ſee the Kingdom of God*, John iii. 3. And this "*Regeneration* he likewiſe aſcribeth to the Operation of the Holy Spirit; *Except a Man be born of* "—*the* SPIRIT, *he cannot enter*, &c." The Point is, What it is to be *regenerated*, or *born again*: *Clagett*, Part I. P. 94, 95. ‖ ἄνωθεν.

And this I shall now endeavour to determine; *First*, By shewing what the *Scripture* means by being *Regenerate*: And, *Secondly*, By refuting what some Modern Divines have taught concerning this Matter.

p 95, 100, 101. §. II. *First*, I am to shew, What the *Scripture* means by being *Regenerate*: But before I enter upon this, it will be proper for me to remove one Mistake which lies in my Way (and which, probably, has been one great Occasion of those many wild and extravagant Notions which have been brought into this Subject); *viz.* "That these Expressions, *To be Born again*, *To be a New Creature*, and the like; do *properly* and *literally* "signifie that which is intended by them." The Vanity of this Pretence will very sufficiently appear from this (*a*) one Observation; *viz.* That whereas "all do confess, that these Expressions are "used to denote *one* and the *same* Thing; *properly* "and *literally* they do not denote *one* and the "*same* Thing, but *divers* Things. That they *pro*"*perly* denote *divers* Things, is plain, For, *to be* "*born* is one Thing, and *to be created* another. "*Adam* by being *created*, could not *properly* be "said to be *born*; nor when an *Infant* is *born*, "can it *properly* be said to be *created*. Therefore, "to *create* and *regenerate*, and to be *created* and "*regenerated*" cannot *properly* be understood, when "they are used to express *the same* Thing; for this "were to say, That *the same* Thing is to be under"stood by them, and not *the same*; which is absurd. "This will farther appear, if we consider what other "Expressions the Scripture useth to denote our being

(*a*) To this Reason our Author adds several more: But, I think, he has over-labour'd the Point; and, therefore, I omit them.

"*rege-*

" *regenerated* and *created anew*. It is called (*b*) " our being *awakened*; our being *raiſed from the* " *Dead*; our having *a new Heart, and a new Spi-* " *rit*. Now, by the ſame Reaſon that being *re-* " *generated* and *created* muſt be *properly* under- " ſtood; by the ſame Reaſon, I ſay, all thoſe " other Expreſſions muſt be *properly* underſtood " too; and then, what monſtrous Abſurdities do " we run into! No Man can *properly* be *raiſed* " *from the Dead*, that was not *created before*. How " then can it *properly* be ſaid, that a Man is *raiſed* " *from the Dead*, and *created* by the ſame Act? " No Man can *properly* be ſaid to be *awakened*, who " is not *alive*. How then is it poſſible, that to " *give Life* and *awaken*, ſhould be the *ſame Thing* " in the *literal* Senſe of the Words?" * Or, What * can be more abſurd, than to ſuppoſe, that in *Regeneration* a Man has *literally* a *New Heart*, and a *New Spirit*? †

†

§. III. Theſe Expreſſions, therefore, are to be underſtood, not *literally* and *properly*, but, *figuratively* and *metaphorically*. And as ſuch, they may all of them, without any Abſurdity at all, be uſed to expreſs a *Regenerate State*. * For there is (as will be ſhewn hereafter) *ſome* Reſemblance between every one of the Things *properly ſignified* by theſe Expreſſions and a *Regenerate State*; and it is by no means neceſſary, in order to juſtify a *figurative* Uſe of any Word or Phraſe, that the *Compariſon* ſhould exactly hold in *every* Particular. † Thus much, therefore, being premiſed, I come now directly to

p. 101.

*

†

(*b*) It muſt be taken Notice, That theſe Expreſſions do not any of them, nor were they ſuppoſed by our Author to, reach *the Whole* of what is meant by being *Regenerate*. But if they expreſs *any Part* of it (as moſt certainly they do), the Argument will be juſt the ſame.

p. 117. ſhew, What the Scripture means by being *Regenerate* or *Born again*: And I ſay in general, That, " in its utmoſt Meaning, it ſignifies, *to become a* " *ſincere Proſelyte or Diſciple of our Lord Jeſus.* " I ſhall firſt briefly ſhew, What is meant by being " a *ſincere Diſciple* of Jeſus Chriſt; and then prove " *That* to be the Meaning of a *Regenerate State.*

p. 118, 119. §. IV. " To be a *ſincere Proſelyte* or *Diſciple* of " Jeſus Chriſt, conſiſts then in theſe Two Things; " *viz.* 1. In being *baptized* as our Saviour requires. " And, 2. In making good the *Profeſſion* of *Bap-* " *tiſm*; which is, To *believe* in Chriſt, and *obey* " his *Commandments.* This is clearly anſwerable " to that Rule which our bleſſed Lord gave to his " Apoſtles, according to which they were to make " Men his Diſciples. *Go ye, therefore, and teach* " *all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the* " *Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*; " *i. e.* admitting them by Baptiſm into the Church, " and thereby ingaging them to believe, and pro- " feſs their Faith in, the Father, Son, and Holy " Ghoſt, and of that Doctrine to which they have " born Record. *Teaching them to obſerve all things* " *whatſoever I have commanded you*; *i. e.* and by " the ſame Baptiſm ingaging them to obey my " Commands. That, therefore, which makes us " ſincere Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt, is thus to *be-* " *lieve* and *obey*, as we are by Baptiſm ingaged. " Now becauſe to *obey* the Commands of Chriſt, " whatever we loſe or ſuffer by it, is the cleareſt " Proof we can give to our-ſelves or others, that " we do, in good Earneſt, own him to be our " *Lord* and *Maſter*, and that we do heartily be- " lieve him to be the *Son of God*; therefore, we " find, that our Saviour ſpeaks of this Obedience " to him, as if it were the *only* Thing in which " our being his Diſciples did conſiſt. For thus

John

" *John* xv. 8. *Herein is my Father glorified, that ye*
" *bear much Fruit*; *i. e.* That ye be fruitful in
" Piety and Good Works; *ſo ſhall ye be my Diſci-*
" *ples.* The ſame Thing is affirmed of Obedience
" to *one*, but that a very remarkable, Precept of
" our Saviour, *John* xiii. 34. *A new Commandment*
" *I give unto you, That ye love one another as I have*
" *loved you. By this ſhall all Men know that ye are*
" *my Diſciples*, &c. Now we are not to think,
" that this *laſt* Saying of our Saviour concerning
" that *one* Inſtance of Obedience to him; or that
" the *former* concerning Obedience in *general*; do
" exclude either the *one*, Obedience to the *reſt* of
" his Laws, or the *other*, *believing* him to be *the*
" *Son of God*, from being neceſſary to make us his
" true Diſciples: But that, by ſuch an high Act of
" Vertue as to love our Brethren as Chriſt loved
" us, it may ſtrongly be concluded, that we will
" not ſtick at any thing he requires of us; and
" that our yielding a ſincere Obedience to all his
" Commands, does clearly ſuppoſe, that we be-
" lieve him to be *the Son of God*, and all his Pro-
" miſes to be true. Hence our Saviour does not
" admit that we can be his Diſciples, if we do not
" intirely ſubmit our-ſelves to him. *If any Man*
" (ſays he) *come to me, and hate not his Father and*
" *Mother, yea, and his own Life alſo, he cannot be*
" *my Diſciple*; *i. e.* Unleſs he loves God, and
" Truth, and Goodneſs ſo much more than all his
" worldly Intereſts, even his Life it-ſelf, that he
" may be ſaid to *hate* theſe Things, when his Love
" to them is compared with his Love to Chriſt, he
" cannot be a Diſciple of Chriſt; *i. e.* He cannot
" be a *true* Diſciple of Chriſt; he cannot anſwer
" the Profeſſion of Baptiſm whilſt it is thus with
" him. For, *if ye continue in my Word*; *i. e.* To
" do according to it, whatever befalls you for ſo
" doing in this World; *then are ye my Diſci-*

" *ples* INDEED, as our Lord tells us, *John* " viii. 31.

p. 119, 120. §. V. " The beſt Notion then that we can frame " of a *true Diſciple* of *Chriſt*, and that to which " we are guided by *Chriſt* himſelf, is, That he is " one who ſo firmly believes that *Jeſus* to be *the* " *Son of God*, and that all his Promiſes are true, " as to be led thereby to love him above all " Things" ; to yield himſelf up to him by *Baptiſm*, and thence-forward to pay " an hearty Obe- " dience to all his Commandments. I am now to " prove, That the State of *Regeneration* means no " more, than to become *ſuch* a *Diſciple* of Chriſt as " I have deſcribed." And this, I think, may be very plainly argued from this general Obſervation ; *viz.* " That *unleſs* we be *regenerate*, we cannot " ſee the Kingdom of God ; and withal, that *if we* " *be regenerate*, we have all that is *neceſſary* to " qualify us for that Kingdom." This is granted on all hands : " And it *is*," or *muſt* alſo be " ac- " knowledged, that it is equally *neceſſary* and *ſuf-* " *ficient* for this End, that we be the *true Diſciples* " of *Jeſus Chriſt*. For *he that* BELIEVETH, *and* " *is* BAPTIZED, *ſhall be ſaved*. And *Chriſt is* " *the Author of eternal Salvation to them that* " OBEY *him*. Now from hence, I ſay, it follows, " by undeniable Conſequence, That *Regeneration*," and whatever other *Metaphorical* Expreſſions are equivalent to it, " do ſignify nothing elſe but a " Man's being " a *true Diſciple* of Jeſus Chriſt. " For if *Regeneration* ſignifies any *other* State, then, " 1ſt." To be a *true Diſciple* of Jeſus Chriſt, " is " not a *ſufficient* Qualification for Pardon of Sin " and eternal Happineſs, contrary to thoſe clear " Texts now mentioned. For, beſides this, that " *other State* ſuppoſed to be meant by *Regeneration*, " would be *neceſſary*. And, 2. (which is equally

" con-

" contrary to the Scripture)" To be a *true Disciple* of Jesus Christ, " would not so much as be " *necessary* to qualify us for Salvation; since that " *other State*, supposed to be meant by *Regenera-* " *tion*, would be *sufficient* without it."

§. VI. * But to come to Particulars. There will be little room to doubt what is meant by being *Regenerate*, when we have seen how our Saviour himself has explained that Phrase. After having told *Nicodemus*, *John* iii. 3. That *except a Man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God*; he adds, *Ver.* 5. *Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* This *latter* Verse, you see, sets forth the (*c*) *Particulars* of that *New Birth*, which in the *former* our Saviour had spoken of under *general Terms*. So that if these *Particulars* do constitute *the Whole* of what is meant by being a true Disciple of Jesus Christ, and no more; it will follow (Christ himself being his own Interpreter) that to be *Regenerate*, signifies no more, than being a *true Disciple* of Jesus Christ. And that this is the Truth of the Case, I shall now endeavour to make appear, by shewing, *First*, That *to be born of Water*, signifies, the being *received* or *admitted* as *Proselytes* to Christ *by Baptism*. And, *Secondly*, That *to be born of the Spirit*, denotes, that *Love* and *Submission* to Christ wrought in us by the Spirit, which leads to *Obedience* to all his Commandments. †

§. VII. *First* then, I say; *To be born of Water*, signifies, the being *received* or *admitted* as a *Proselyte*

(*c*) *Exponit* jam qualem Nativitatem intelligat; ne *Nicodemus* diutius Allegoricæ locutionis Ignorantiâ fallatur, *Grot.*

to Christ *by Baptism.* Some, I know, there are,
p 136, 137. " of whom *Grotius* is one, who conceive, that by " an ἐν διὰ δυοῖν, these Words signify, The *sanctifying* " *ing* or *cleansing Spirit of God.*" Our Saviour, he tells us, (*d*) *doth not here speak of Baptism*, but only *alludes to it*: " Just as he supposeth him to " *allude* to the *Eucharist* in those Words, *Except ye* " *eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his* " *Blood, ye have no Life in you*, John vi. 53."
* * But, besides that this Interpretation is intirely
† (*e*) *new*, † there are these Two Reasons to be given why it ought not to be admitted of; *viz.* 1. That " *Baptism* was a *Ceremony* of *Proselytism* among " the *Jews*, which our Saviour borrowed from
* " them." * Or, whether he borrowed it from the *Jews* or not, 'tis certain, that he *appointed* this *Ceremony* to be used in the receiving or admitting
† *Proselytes* to his Religion †. " Now the *Jews* " called their Proselytes (*f*) *Recens Nati*, New- " born Men; and, as such, counted them to have " quitted their Relation to their former Country, " Kindred and Parents. Wherefore, we may well " conceive, that by being *born of Water*, our Savi- " our meant, *becoming a Proselyte to him* by *Bap-* " *tism*; and otherwise, it would not have been so " strange a Thing, that *Nicodemus*, tho' *a Master* " *of Israel*, should not have understood" what he was speaking about. " 2. St. *Paul* expressly calls " *Baptism* λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, *the Washing*, or rather, " *the Laver of Regeneration*; which what it signi-

---

(*d*) Non loquitur de *Baptismo*, sed locutiones sunt *alludentes* ad Baptismum, *Grot.*

(*e*) That the Ancients universally understood this Text to speak of *Baptism*, any one will be convinced, who will read the learned Mr. *Wall*'s History of *Infant-Baptism.*

(*f*) See Dr. *Hammond.* Not. in *John* iii. a. See also Mr. *Wall*'s Hist. *Inf. Bapt. Introd.* § 6.

" fies,

" fies, but a *Means whereby* we are *regenerated*, " or whereby we become the *Diſciples* of Chriſt, I " cannot underſtand." According to the Apoſtle therefore, to be made a *Diſciple* to Chriſt by *Baptiſm*, is to be *born of Water*. " Now where there " is not only no Neceſſity to find a *Figure* in Scri- " pture-Phraſes, but the *proper* Senſe alſo contains " a Truth very *(g)* pertinent to the Subject ſpoken " of; *there*, in all Reaſon, the *proper* Senſe (and, " conſequently, *here* of the Word *Water*) ought to " be followed. And then, being *born of Water*, " will ſignify our being *admitted* into the *Church* " as *Diſciples* to Chriſt, and ingaged to be ſo for " the future by *Baptiſm*." *In Truth, there is in every reſpect ſo exact a Reſemblance between the Words of St. *Paul*, and thoſe of our *Saviour*, that we cannot doubt, but that he had them in View, and that the one was intended as an Explanation of the other. Our Saviour ſays, That *except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot*, &c. St. *Paul* tells us, That we are *ſaved by the Laver of Regeneration, and Renewing of the Holy Ghoſt*. Where, as the *Renewing of the Holy Ghoſt* directly anſwers to the being *born of the Spirit*; ſo the *Laver of Regeneration* as directly anſwers to the being *born of Water*. † *

†

§. VIII. By being *born of Water*, then, our Saviour moſt certainly meant, the being *admitted* as *Proſelytes* to him by *Baptiſm*; And no leſs evident it is, that by being *born of the Spirit*, is to be underſtood, the being endued with that *Love* and

---

(g) How pertinent it was for our Saviour to tell *Nicodemus*, That a Man muſt become a *Proſelyte* to him by *Baptiſm*, the Reader will perceive by-and-by, when he comes to our Author's *Paraphraſe* upon this whole Diſcourſe.

Sub-

Submiſſion to Chriſt, which leads to *Obedience* to all his Commandments. * For, to be *born of the Spirit*, and to be *born of God*, are Phraſes denoting one and the ſame Thing. Now the Effects of this *latter* are thus deſcribed by the Apoſtle †: 1 *John* v 4, 5. "*Whatſoever is born of God overcometh* "*the World*; *and this is the Victory that overcom-* "*eth the World, even our Faith. Who is he that* "*overcometh the World, but he that believeth that* "*Jeſus is the Son of God?* Here we have the full "Character of one that is *born of God*. He is one "who *ſo* believeth that *Jeſus* is *the Son of God*, "that his Faith prevails againſt all Worldly Temptations, and who, therefore, keeps the Commandments of God." And to the ſame Purpoſe, *Chap.* iii. *Ver.* 9. "*Whoſoever is born of God*, "*doth not commit Sin*; *for his Seed remaineth in* "*him, and he cannot ſin, becauſe he is born of God.* "That is, Such is the State and Temper of his "Mind; ſuch is the Diſpoſition of his *Will* and "*Affections*, that he doth not ſin; but his Life is "agreeable to the Laws of God: *For his Seed re-* "*maineth in him*; i. e. The *Word* of *God*, that "*Divine Seed*, (as it is called *Mat.* xiii. 19. 1 *Pet.* "i. 23.) hath wrought its due and proper Effect "upon his Soul, and is become an effectual Principle of Obedience and a Holy Life; which it "always will be, where it is received into an honeſt and a good Heart. Therefore, the Apoſtle "adds, *And he cannot ſin*; by which he means "not that it is *abſolutely*, but that it is *morally* "impoſſible for him to ſin; it being directly contrary to the *Senſe* and *Genius* of his Soul, to the "Frame and Temper of his Mind, ſo to do. It "is not the Conſideration of Worldly Intereſt; it "is not the Want of Temptation and Opportunity, that keeps him at any time from offending God; ſo much as the Senſe of his Duty, his

† pag. 121, 122.

"Love

" Love of Vertue, and the Conformity of his " Mind to the Laws of God. Such is the State of " him who is *born of God*; " Now as every one that is *born of God*, SO *believeth* in Jesus Christ, as to *overcome the World* and all its Temptations; So it is also true, that every one THUS *believing* in Christ, and *overcoming the World*, is *born of God*. For says the same Apostle, " *Whoever believeth* " *that* Jesus *is the Christ*, *is born of God*; i. e. " Whoever believes with *Such* a *Faith* as implies " *Obedience*, which is afterward expresly added in " those Terms of *keeping God's Commandments*, " and *overcoming the World*, 1 John v. 1, 2, 3. " And again, *Chap.* ii. *ver.* 29. *If ye know that he* " *is righteous*, *ye know that every one that doth* " *Righteousness*, *is* BORN OF HIM. " From all this, I think, it is very evident, that to be *born of God* or to be *born of the Spirit*, denotes *Such* a *Faith* in *Jesus Christ*, as begets a *Conformity* of *Mind* to his Laws and Commandments. * Which will appear yet farther, from the Words of St. *Paul*, *Gal.* vi. 15. *In Christ Jesus*, says he, *neither Circumcision availeth any thing*, *nor Uncircumcision*, *but a* NEW-CREATURE. Now thus he expresseth the same thing in different Places. *In Jesus Christ neither Circumcision availeth any thing*, *nor Uncircumcision*, *but* FAITH, WHICH WORKETH BY LOVE, *Gal.* v. 6. And; *Circumcision is nothing*, *and Uncircumcision is nothing*, *but the* KEEPING THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, 1 *Cor.* vii. 19. Who sees not here that this *New Creature*, this *Spiritual Birth*, is equivalent to that *Faith* which *worketh by Love*, to the *keeping the Commandments of God?* †

§. IX. You see now what is the the true and full Import of being *Regenerate* or *Born again*; *viz.* That it implies, 1. A State of *Proselytism* to Christ by *Baptism*. And, 2. A State of *Conformity* to his Doctrine

Doctrine and Precepts, which is that which our
* *Baptiſm* ingages us to. * Now, tho' this is the only *compleat* and *adequate* Notion of *Regeneration*, yet you cannot but have obſerved in going along, that *to be Regenerate* and thoſe other Phraſes equivalent to it, are frequently uſed in a more *confined* Senſe, and have a *Peculiar*, or at leaſt a *more principal* Relation, ſometimes to the *one* of the above-mentioned *Particulars*, and ſometimes tot he *other*. In the Texts cited in the foregoing Paragraph, to be *born of God*, and to be *a New Creature*, do certainly denote that *Submiſſion* or *Subjection* to the Will of Chriſt, which the *Spirit* works in the Heart of every true Diſciple. For this is *that*, and that *only*, which both inables us to *overcome the World*, and makes it *impoſſible* for us (ſo long as it laſts) to be *overcome by it*. But when St. *Paul* ſpeaks of the *Laver of Regeneration*, Tit. iii. 5. there the Word *Regeneration* peculiarly ſignifies, that State which we are admitted to by our *Baptiſm*; *i. e.* The State of *Proſelytiſm* or *Diſcipleſhip*, which is here expreſly diſtinguiſhed from the ἀνακαίνωσις Πνεύματος ἁγίου, the *Renewing of the Holy Ghoſt*, or that *inward Change* of *Mind* which leads us to Obedience. And thus I underſtand thoſe Words of the ſame Apoſtle, 2 *Cor.* v. 17. *If any Man be in Chriſt, he (b) is a New Creature.* The *New Creature*, I ſay, in this Place, denotes that *Relative State* we are in towards Chriſt, as his *Diſciples* by *Baptiſm*; as will appear by conſidering the Context. For

(b) Εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις. The Sentence is *Elliptical*, and may be ſupplied either by ἔστι or ἔστω. It may be read either *he is* a New Creature, or *let him be* a New Creature. If there were no other Reaſon for it, it would be enough to determine me in favour of the vulgar Tranſlation; *viz.* That the following part of the Verſe runs all in the *Indicative* Mood. Τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονε καινὰ τὰ πάντα.

at

at the 14th *Verſe* (ſpeaking of himſelf as an *Apoſtle*) St. *Paul* ſays; *The Love of Chriſt, conſtraineth us, becauſe we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live, ſhould not henceforth live unto themſelves, but unto him which died for them, and roſe again.* That is, The Love of Chriſt towards us, is a very ſtrong and prevailing Motive with us, his Miniſters, to do his Will. For thus we argue, That if Chriſt died for all, then were all dead; and that Chriſt died for all, that thoſe who now live through him, ſhould not henceforward live after their own Luſts and Deſires, but in Obedience to the Commandments of him who died and roſe again for them. *Wherefore* (adds he, *verſe* 16.) *henceforth know we no Man after the Fleſh*; i. e. We regard or conſider no Man according to the Fleſh. We look upon all Worldly Relations to be as nothing, in Compariſon to that near and intimate Relation we ſtand in towards Chriſt; *Yea, though we have* [or rather *(i) had*] *known Chriſt after the Fleſh, yet now henceforth know we him* [ſo] *no more*; i. e. Tho' we were of the Number of thoſe who perſonally knew Chriſt, and were his near Friends and Relations; yet ſhould we conſider him not *according to* that Relation, but according to that *much higher Relation* which he bears towards us as our *King* and *Redeemer.* And this he obſerves (*verſe* 17.) is the Caſe not of the Miniſters of Chriſt only, but of all who have given up themſelves unto him by *Baptiſm.* For *if any Man be in Chriſt* (*i. e.* be a *(k)* Diſciple of Chriſt) *he is a New Creature*; i. e. He

---

(*i*) Ἐγνώκαμεν. Hic eſt *Indicativus* pro *Subjunctivo*, more Hebræo. *Grot.*

(*k*) To be *in Chriſt*, and to *put on Chriſt*, are Phraſes of the ſame Import. Now the Apoſtle tells us, *Gal.* iii. 27. That *as many as have been baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt.*

is to be considered as one who has, in a manner, *quitted* his *Relation* to the *Men* and *Things* of this World; As one who is brought into a *New State*, under *New Capacities* and *New Obligations*: For *Old Things are* [now] *passed away; behold, all Things are become New.* †

† 2 Cor. v. 17.

§. X. From the whole, then, As we clearly perceive what is meant by being *Regenerate*, so we may, also, as clearly understand the *Reasons* why the Scripture useth this *Metaphor*; which, by way of Illustration, it may not be amiss briefly to set down. When we speak of being *Regenerate* or *Born again*, we refer to something which we *now are*, and which we *were not before*. Now, whoever considers the *Difference* that there is between the *State* of a *Regenerate* and of an *Unregenerate* Man, either as a *Regenerate State* denotes our *Relation* to God, by being the *Disciples* of Jesus Christ; or as it signifies that *inward Temper* and *Disposition*, which is wrought in us by the *Operations* of the *Spirit*; whoever, I say, compares these two different *States* together, in either of these respects; will find so great a *Change* made by our *removing* from the *one* to the *other*, as may well justify the expressing it by the *Similitude* of the *Natural Birth*. For, 1. As to that *Relative State* which we stand in towards God, by being the *Disciples* of Jesus Christ, the Comparison is obvious; and has, in part, been already hinted at. * From the *Natural Birth* results a *peculiar* Relation between the *Child* and the *Parent*, which is the Foundation of several *Obligations* and *Claims* to and from each other reciprocally. The *Child* owes a *Duty* to its *Parent*, which it does not owe to any other of its Fellow-Creatures; and the *Parent* stands indebted to the *Child* in certain *Benefits* or *Privileges*, which cannot be challenged where this *Relation* doth not intervene. Now thus it is in our *Spiritual Birth*. By becoming

p. 139, to 141.

* 1 Cor. iv. 15.

becoming the *Disciples* of Jesus Christ, we contract a more *near* and *intimate Relation* to God the Father, whose *adopted Children* we are, who hereby acquires a *peculiar additional* Right to our Services, and from whom, in virtue of our *Obedience*, we may claim *Spiritual* and *Peculiar Favours*, even *that Promise which he has promised us*, ETERNAL LIFE, 1 *John* ii. 25. *We were* (says the Apostle, *Eph.* ii. 3.) *by Nature the Children of Wrath, having no Hope*, as being *Strangers from the Covenants of Promise*, verse 12. *But now, in Christ Jesus, we, who before were afar off, are made nigh by the Blood of Christ*, who hath *reconciled* us *unto God*, and *through* whom, *we have an Access unto the Father.* So that we *are no more Strangers and Foreigners, but Fellow-Citizens with the Saints, and of the Houshold of God*, verse 13, to 20. † 2dly, The Comparison will be no less visible, if we consider *Regeneration* as it denotes that *inward Temper* and *Disposition* of Mind, which is wrought in us by the *Operations* of the *Spirit.* For hereby "our "*Understandings* are informed with the *Knowledge* "of those Truths concerning God, Our Selves, and "a Life to come, which we are most of all con- "cerned to know; which is *the Excellency of the* "*Knowledge of Christ Jesus.*" * He who knoweth not Christ, *knoweth nothing*; *i. e.* he knoweth nothing to any good End and Purpose. And accordingly, this *Ignorance* is every where in Scripture represented as a State of *Blindness*, *Darkness*, *&c.* and the *Gospel* is called, The *Key of Knowledge*, The *Light of the World*, The *Truth*, The *Knowledge of God*; as if it were the *only* Truth, and the *only* Knowledge. He, therefore, who removes out of a State of *Ignorance*, or rather out of a State of *Insensibility*, into a State of *Knowledge*, may very well be represented as being *born again* †. "But that "*intrinsic* Alteration which seems to afford the "cleareſt

† * †

" cleareſt Similitude, regards that *Senſe* of *Good* " and *Evil* which is proper to a *true Chriſtian*. We " know, that all living Creatures have ſuch a *Senſe* " of Things *hurtful* and *deſtructive* to them, that " thereby they are generally prompted to avoid " them. 'Tis thus, I ſay, in the *Natural Life*, " that we readily apprehend what is contrary to " it; and, therefore, we do not run into the Fire, " nor venture down Precipices, becauſe theſe things " are *deſtructive* to our *Natures*. And this is a " very fit *Emblem* of the State of a *true Chriſtian*. " For, by reaſon of that *Divine Temper* of Soul " which is wrought in him by the *Holy Spirit*, he " hath ſuch a like *Senſe* of *Good* and *Evil*, with re- " gard to his *Mind* and *Conſcience*, as all living " Creatures have with reſpect to their *Natures*. " He, therefore, who is a *true Chriſtian*, is ſaid to " be *born again*, and to become a *New Creature*; " becauſe he hath a *New Senſe* of things: He hath " other *Apprehenſions* of *Sin*, than *Senſual* and " *Worldly* Men have; he looks not upon any *Im-* " *morality* as an *harmleſs* Thing; but apprehends " all kinds of *Wickedneſs* to be (what they really " are) *pernicious* and *deteſtable*. And this is the " Reaſon (as I have already obſerved) of what " S. *John* ſaith; *He that is born of God, ſinneth not,* " *and he cannot ſin, becauſe, he is born of God.* "

For by this *Senſe* of *Good* and *Evil*, " is produced " a proportionable Change in Mens *Wills* and *Affe-* " *ctions*, which, from being addicted to *Senſuality* " and *Worldlineſs*, are come to be ſtrongly incli- " ned to *Holineſs* and *Vertue*. This likewiſe pro- " duceth a ſuitable Change in their *Lives*; which " are now led not according to the *Luſts* of the *Fleſh*, " and the Examples of *evil* Men; but according " to the *Laws* of *God*, and the Example of *Chriſt*. " And thus they come to the true *Uſe* of all their " *Faculties*; as an *Infant*, after it is *born*, falls in-

" to

" to thoſe *natural Motions*, which before were ob-
" ſtructed by its Impriſonment in the Womb."

§. XI. " Lay all theſe Things together, and no- P. 141,
" thing will be more evident to you, than that ſo 142.
" great a *Change* of our State is implied, in our be-
" ing the *true Diſciples* of Chriſt, that we are, as
" it were, *other Men* by being ſo, and ſo may
" fitly be ſaid to be *born again*, when we become
" ſuch Perſons." And this *Change* of our State being ſo much for the *better*, and making us "*more* " *excellent* Perſons than we were before," this ſuggeſts to us " another Reaſon for the Choice of this " *Metaphor*; *viz.* The great *Advantages* we gain " by it. We have, as it were, a *new Being* given " us, when we truly believe in Jeſus Chriſt, and " conform our-ſelves to his Doctrine and Example: " We are *ſo much* alter'd for the better, as if we had " never lived *'till then*; and we have infinitely " more Reaſon to think of *this Alteration* in our " *State*, than to remember the *Day* of our *Birth* " with Joy and Gladneſs. Hence we find, that " the Scriptures not only have repreſented the *Ad-* " *vantages* we gain by the Goſpel of our Saviour, " by *Metaphors* taken from Things moſt *grateful* " to our *natural Appetites*, as *Liberty*, *Life* and " *Light*; but withal have aſſured us, That the *Good* " implied in thoſe Things, does, in a more emi- " nent manner, belong to the *true Diſciples* of " Jeſus Chriſt. *If the Son ſhall make you free, then* " *are you free* INDEED, *John* viii. 36. Now, " what this *Freedom* is, we are told *Verſe* 32. *The* " TRUTH *ſhall make you free*; and *Verſe* 34. *He* " *that committeth Sin, is the* SERVANT *of Sin.* " So that this *Freedom* conſiſteth in the *Knowledge* " of the *Truth*, and in *Obedience* to the *Laws* of " God, which is that very State, that the Scri-

" pture elſewhere calls *Light* and *Life*, and being " *born again*, and *created anew.*"

p. 142, 143. §. XII. Upon all theſe Accounts, then, it appears, that the Phraſes, To be *born again*, and To be a *New Creature*, are very apt *Metaphors* whereby to expreſs our being the *true Diſciples* of Jeſus Chriſt. I need not obſerve to you, That " ſince " it is by the *Operations* of the *Spirit*, that we be- " come *true Believers* and *good Men*, our being " then ſaid to be born *of God*, or *of the Spirit*, does " fitly expreſs the *Concurrence* of that *Divine* " *Power*, by which this *Change* is *effected* in us. " As to thoſe *other* Metaphors which the Scripture " uſeth to expreſs our being *regenerate*, the Uſe " and Meaning of them all, is eaſily diſcernable, " tho' none of them ſeem to be ſo *full* and *ſignificant* " as theſe." *Converting* or *turning*; *Taking away the Heart of Stone, and giving the Heart of Fleſh*; *Making a new Heart, and a new Spirit*, do all of them ſignify " that *Change* which is wrought in " the Diſpoſitions of our Minds: *Purifying*, *Clean-* " *ſing* and *Purging*, expreſs the *Excellency* of this " *Change*, and how much our Natures are *better'd* " by it." But theſe Phraſes, *To be born again*, *To be a new Creature* (and thoſe other which convey the ſame Idea, as *Quickening* and *Raiſing from the Dead*) " contain *all* thoſe *Similitudes* which are " *ſeverally* diſcernable in the reſt, and expreſs *all* " the *Advantages* we gain by the *Faith* and *Obedi-* " *ence* of the Goſpel, whether *inherent* or *relative*. " As *this*, probably, is the Reaſon why they are " more frequently uſed in Scripture than the reſt " are, ſo *that*, alſo, may be the Reaſon why it " hath obtained amongſt Chriſtian Writers, to treat " of the *Conditions* of *Eternal Life* more frequently " under the Name of *Regeneration* and the *New* " *Creature*,

" *Creature*, than any other Phraſes whereby they " are *Metaphorically* expreſſed. And, poſſibly, alſo, " this *common Uſe* of theſe Expreſſions, may have " been an Occaſion to ſome unwary Men, of ima- " gining, that they are to be underſtood *properly*. " But the Reader, I hope, will acknowledge, that " I have given a plain and reaſonable Account of " the Uſe of theſe *Metaphors*, by ſhewing, where " the *Similitude* lies between the *proper* and *figura-* " *tive* Significations of them;" and by this any reaſonable Perſon may alſo ſee, how far we may ſafely argue from them. " If any Man can go far- " ther, and find out *more* Similitudes between the " *Metaphors*, and that which is meant by them, I " ſhall not be his Adverſary, provided he keeps " himſelf within the Bounds of Senſe and Reaſon. " But to argue (as ſome have done) from the *pro-* " *per* Signification of any one, or all of theſe *Me-* " *taphors*, ſo as to conclude ſomething Parallel in " the State of a *Believer* to *every thing* which can " *properly* be affirmed of them, (is, as has *(l)* elſe- " where been ſhewn at large) to run upon ſuch " wild and abſurd Conſequences, as any wiſe Man " would be aſhamed to own, and any good Man " would be afraid to faſten upon the Scriptures."

§. XIII. And now, " though I have, as I con- p 144, " ceive, ſufficiently proved, That to be *born again*, to 149. " is to *become a true Diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt*, yet, " for farther Confirmation, and becauſe it may be " of Uſe to the Ordinary Reader, I ſhall make it " plain, that this Notion is agreeable to the Scope " and Deſign of our Saviour's Diſcourſe to *Nicode-* " *mus*. It is one of the beſt ways of interpreting " any difficult Paſſage in Divine or Humane Au- " thors, to obſerve the *Deſign* of that whole Diſ-

(l) Diſcourſe concerning the *Operations* of the *Holy Spirit*. *Chap.* 11. §. 3.

" courſe to which it belongs; and then to fix ſuch " a Meaning upon that Paſſage, as is apparently " ſuitable to the *Scope* of the Author, if the Words " will bear that Meaning. Now, that the Phraſe " of being *Regenerate* or *Born again*, will *bear* that " Senſe which I have aſſigned to it, I have ſhewn; " and that it is the *true Senſe* of it in *other* Places " of Scripture, I have alſo proved: Wherefore, if " I ſhew alſo, that *this Senſe* of the Phraſe is con- " ſonant to the plain *Scope* of our *Saviour* in *this* " Diſcourſe, nothing can be further deſired to de- " monſtrate, that it is indeed the *true meaning* of " it *here*." Our Saviour, then, in this Diſcourſe with *Nicodemus*, ſeems to have intended theſe Two Things, *viz.* " *Firſt*, To ſhew, That *Faith* in, and " *Obedience* to him, were the means by which God " had appointed to bring Men to eternal Happineſs. " And, *Secondly*, to ſhew, The Unreaſonableneſs " of the *Jews*, who would not believe in him. " The former we find *Verſe* 16. *For God ſo loved* " *the World, that he gave his only begotten Son,* " *that whoſoever believeth in him, ſhould not periſh,* " *but have everlaſting Life.* That is, This is the " way by which God hath determined to ſave Man- " kind, even by *Faith* in his *only begotten Son:* " And this was ſo great a Demonſtration of God's " Love to Man, thus to give his *only begotten Son,* " that no Man could hope to eſcape the Anger of " God, who ſhould refuſe the Benefit of this *Sacri-* " *fice.* For the *Son of God* was to be *lifted up upon* " the Croſs, *as Moſes lifted up the Serpent in the* " *Wilderneſs* (a rude ſavage Place, and ſo fit to be " the Figure of that *corrupted State* of the *World* " in which Chriſt came to dye for us) *that whoſoever* " *believeth in him, ſhould not periſh*, &c. *verſes* 14, " 15. Wherefore, though indeed *God ſent not* " *his Son into the World to condemn the World, but* " *that the World through him might be ſaved*;

" (verſe

" (verſe 17.) yet *he that believeth not, is condemned*
" *already*; i. e. He is in a State to which Condem-
" nation belongs, *becauſe he hath not believed in*
" *the Name of the only begotten Son of God*; i. e.
" for refuſing ſo gracious an Opportunity of Sal-
" vation as was now offered, *Verſe* 18. *Secondly*,
" Our Saviour ſhews the *Unreaſonableneſs* of thoſe
" Men that believe not; and that by noting, 1.
" The *Evidence* of that Truth which they disbelie-
" ved. And, 2. The true *Cauſe* of their Unbelief.
" The *former* he admoniſhed *Nicodemus* of in theſe
" Words, *Verily, verily, I ſay unto thee, We ſpeak*
" *that we do know, and teſtify that we have ſeen,*
" *and ye receive not our Teſtimony*, verſe 11. i. e.
" You believe not my Doctrine concerning the
" *Way* by which you muſt come to *ſee the Kingdom*
" *of God*, although it be evidently true. For this
" is that very Meſſage which I bring you from
" God; This is that Counſel and Decree of God
" which I come from him to teſtify unto you; *viz.*
" That there is no other way but that. Now,
" this you acknowledge, that *I am a Teacher ſent*
" *from God, becauſe* (as you confeſs) *no Man can do*
" *thoſe Miracles which I do, except God be with him*,
" verſe 2.; How ſtrangely incredulous therefore
" are you, that you will not believe me delivering
" that Doctrine, which by theſe Teſtimonies of
" my coming from God, I confirm? 2. Chriſt aſ-
" ſigneth the true *Cauſe* of this Unbelief. *This is*
" *the Condemnation, that Light is come into the World,*
" *and Men loved Darkneſs rather than Light, becauſe*
" *their Deeds are evil*, verſe 19. That is, The
" Cauſe why Men believe not my Doctrine, is not
" becauſe they want Reaſon and Argument to in-
" duce them to it; but becauſe their *Deeds are evil*,
" becauſe my Doctrine is ſo contrary to their *Luſts*
" and *Vices*, that they are not *willing* it ſhould be true,
" and ſo do not *attend* to the *Evidence* of its Truth;

" and, therefore, greater ſhall be their Condem-
" nation. *Every one that doth evil, hateth the*
" *Light, neither cometh to the Light, leſt his Deeds*
" *ſhould be reproved. But he that doth the Truth*;
" i. e. He who is ſincerely diſpoſed to do whatever
" is the Will of God; *cometh to the Light, that his*
" *Deeds may be manifeſt, that they are wrought in*
" *God*; i. e. He is not unwilling to have his Actions
" proved whether they be according to the Will of
" God or not. This is the Scope of our Saviour's
" Diſcourſe, and, therefore, it is plain, that ſup-
" poſing the *true Diſciple* of Chriſt is to be under-
" ſtood by the *Regenerate Man*, the Beginning of
" our Saviour's Diſcourſe, concerning the *Neceſſity*
" of *Regeneration*, is conſonant to his evident
" Deſign, which was, to ſhew why we muſt be his
" Diſciples, and how inexcuſable we are are if we
" be not. But that the Connexion of the Whole
" may be more clearly ſeen; I ſhall here ſubjoyn
" a *Paraphraſe* of this Diſcourſe, ſo far as it con-
" cerns the Matter in hand, proceeding upon that
" Notion of *Regeneration* which has already been
" laid down.

p. 149, to 157. §. XIV. " It is probable (as *Grotius* obſerves)
" That after *Nicodemus* had acknowledged our
" Saviour to be ſent from God, he asked him,
" *What Qualifications* a Man muſt have *to ſee the*
" *Kingdom of God?* To which Queſtion our Savi-
" our's Anſwer was,

Verſe 3. *Except a Man be born again, he cannot ſee the Kingdom of God*; i. e. " No Man can enter
" into the Kingdom of God, except he become my
" Diſciple, which you ſeem unwilling to be, becauſe
" you come ſecretly to me for fear of the *Jews*.
" But, I tell you, it is not ſufficient for you to
" acknowledge to Me, that I am a Teacher ſent
" from God, but, withal, you muſt become one
" of

" of my Disciples, and own your-self so to be, " though you forfeit thereby the Honour you have " in the *Jewish* State; for you must forsake " All to follow me." *Nicodemus* not understanding this to be our Saviour's Meaning, * or dissembling, perhaps, what he well enough understood, † replies as if it were required that a Man should be born again in the *literal* and *proper* Sense of the Words. For,

Verse 4. Nicodemus *saith unto him, How can a Man be born when he is old? Can he enter the Second Time into his Mother's Womb, and be born?*

Verse 5. Jesus *answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*; i. e. " It is not such a Birth that I mean. You " must be *born* of *Water* i. e. You must by *Baptism* become a professed *Disciple* of mine. And " you must be *born of the Spirit*; i. e. It is equally " necessary, that by the Operations of the Holy " Spirit (the Promise whereof is part of my Doctrine) you become obedient in Heart and Life " to those Laws which I deliver.

Verse 6. *That which is born of the Flesh, is Flesh*; *and that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit*; i. e. " That which is *born* in the literal Sense, as when " an *Infant* is born of his Mother, is discernable " to your Eyes; and the Change made thereby, is " evident to your grosser Senses. It is not this " Change which I mean; but a *Spiritual* Change; " a Change of the *Dispositions* of Mens *Hearts*, " and the *Manner* of their *Lives*; which Change, " together with those *Operations* of the Spirit whereby it is produced, is not discernable the same way " in which the *Natural Birth* is. *(m)*

(m) Some (not improbably) understand this Verse as assigning the *Reason* why it is necessary that a Man should be *born* of *the Spirit*,

Verſe 7. *Marvel not that I ſaid unto thee, Ye muſt be born again.*

Verſe 8. *The Wind bloweth where it liſteth, and thou hearſt the Sound thereof, but canſt not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth; So is every one that is born of the Spirit:* i. e. " And let it not ſurprize " you, that this *Birth* which I ſpeak of, is not diſ- " cernable to the Eye of Senſe: For as the *Wind*, " which bloweth hither and thither, is not diſcern- " able to the Eye; and though we ſee it not, yet " we are aſſured there is ſuch a thing, becauſe we " *hear* it; ſo the *Operations* of the *Spirit*, though " you cannot feel them, yet you may be aſſured " that they *are*, by thoſe *Effects* or *Alterations* in " you that are cauſed by them. "

Verſe 9. Nicodemus *anſwered and ſaid unto him, How can theſe Things be?*

Verſe 10. Jeſus *anſwered and ſaid unto him: Art thou a Maſter of Iſrael, and knoweſt not theſe Things?* i. e. " Art thou one of the *great Council*, a " Learned *Jew*, and yet ignorant of theſe Mat- " ters? Do you not perceive that I ſpeak to you " of the Neceſſiety of becoming my Diſciple, in ſuch " Language, as any Man who is verſed in your " Cuſtoms, and the Writings of the Prophets, may " eaſily underſtand? Is not being *born again*, that " very Phraſe whereby you expreſs the making of " a *Proſelyte?* Is not *Waſhing*, one of the Cere- " monies whereby a *Proſelyte* is made among you? " And therefore, when I tell you, That a Man muſt

---

Spirit, and paraphraſe it more briefly thus; *That which is born of the Fleſh*, i. e. Human Nature unaſſiſted by the Holy Spirit, *is Fleſh*, i. e. Lives after the Motions of the Fleſh. But *that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit*, i. e. Lives according to the Motions or Directions of the Spirit.

" be

" be *born* of Water, what ſhould you think I mean, " but that he muſt *become my Diſciple by Baptiſm?* " I have alſo told you, That he muſt be *born of the* " *Spirit* too; and can you be ignorant, that thoſe " Propheſies which ſpeak of the Days of the " *Meſſiah*, do mention the *Operations* of the *Holy* " *Spirit* upon the Hearts of Men, which ſhall then " be liberally beſtowed upon the Subjects of his " Kingdom, to make them Good and Holy? "

Verſe 11. *Verily, verily, I ſay unto thee, We ſpeak that we do know, and teſtify that we have ſeen, and ye receive not our Witneſs*; i. e. Now, I am that " *Meſſiah*; but how credible ſoever that Teſti- " mony is which is given hereof, ye regard it " not. "

Verſe 12. *If I have told you Earthly Things, and ye believe not, how ſhall you believe if I tell you of Heavenly Things?* i. e. " If I have proved by theſe " Miracles (which you acknowledge) that I am the " *Meſſiah*, and yet you will not believe me, and " become my Diſciple; how much more unlikely " is it, that you will believe me, when I tell you, " that I, who am the *Meſſiah*, muſt be *lifted up* upon " a Croſs, and *die* for the Sins of the World *(n)*? " And

---

(n) I conceive, that by *Heavenly Things* here, may probably be meant, ſuch revealed Doctrines, as were *moſt contrary* to the *worldly* and *ſenſual Expectations* of the *Jews* (who had long cheriſhed in themſelves the Notion of a *Meſſiah*, who ſhould fight their Battels, as their other *Saviours* and *Deliverers* had done) *viz.* That *Chriſt* ſhould be *delivered into the Hands of Men*, and be *crucified* for the Sins of the World. And ſo, conſequently, by *Earthly Things* may be underſtood, thoſe Truths which were *not* ſo contrary to theſe Expectations; as, That *Jeſus* was the *Chriſt*; and, That all Men were to be *his Diſciples*; which the *Jews* would have been much more willing to be, had it not been for the Meanneſs of his outward Appearance, and his ignominious Death afterwards. Divers Reaſons concur to ſupport this Interpretation; as, 1. That after our Saviour had made way for it, by

" And yet this is the Purpoſe of God for the Sal-
" vation of Mankind; which, how Strange a thing
" ſoever it may appear to you, you have, yet, all
" the Reaſon in the World to believe upon my
" Teſtimony." For,

Verſe 13. *No Man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man which is in Heaven*; i. e. " No Man
" hath *(o)* known the Secret Purpoſe of God con-
" cerning the way of ſaving Mankind by the Death
" of his Son. *No Man hath* thus *aſcended into*
" *Heaven, but he that is come from Heaven*, whom
" God

---

by telling *Nicodemus* (verſe 13.) that he only *aſcended up into Heaven*, i. e. knew the ſecret Purpoſes of God concerning the Way of Salvation, he immediately falls upon the Mention of that *Death* which he was to undergo for the Sins of the World: *And as Moſes lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderneſs, even ſo muſt the Son of Man be lifted up*, verſe 14. 2. The *Croſs* of Chriſt was that which made the *Jews* moſt of all offended, that his Diſciples ſhould ſtill pretend him to be *the Chriſt*. It was *to the* Jews *a Stumbling-block, and to the* Greeks *Fooliſhneſs*; and, therefore, it is probable, that *this* was the Thing which the *Jews* would hardly believe; *viz.* That God would *ſave Mankind* by the Death of his Son. 3. When St. *Peter* rebuked our Saviour foretelling his own Paſſion, he ſaid unto him, *Get thee behind me, Satan; for thou ſavoureſt not the Things that be of God*, or *Heavenly Things*; i. e. The Wiſdom of God's Way to ſave the World; *but the Things that be of Man.* Thou ſpeakeſt according to the Imaginations of the *Jews*, who perſuade themſelves, that the *Kingdom* of the *Meſſiah* will be *of this World.* After all; The Opinion of *Grotius* that the ἐπίγεια are the *Similitudes* of the *Natural Birth*, and the *Wind*, which our Saviour uſed; And the ἐπουράνια, *Divine Things* ſpoken without this Condeſcention by the uſe of *Metaphors*; And that of Dr. *Hammond*, who ſuppoſes the ἐπίγεια to be Things *ordinary* in the *Jewiſh Law*; want not their Probabilities. But the Notion which I have laid down, does, I think, better agree with the Context, *Clag.* p. 154, 155.

(o) I take this to be a more probable Interpretation of this difficult Place, than that which ſuppoſeth our Saviour to ſpeak here of his *local Aſcenſion* into Heaven afterwards. For, 1. The Words themſelves ſeem not well able to bear the Notion of a *future Aſcenſion.*

" God hath sent to reveal this to you; even he " who now speaketh to you, *who am in Heaven*, " who know the Purposes and Intentions of my " Father; concerning the way of Salvation. "

§. XV. " I shall now leave the Reader to judge, " whether the *Paraphrase* which I have here given " of the former part of our Saviour's Discourse " to *Nicodemus*, does not make the Connexion be- " tween all the Parts of it very clear; and also, " whether our understanding the *Regenerate* Man " to be a *true Disciple* of *Christ* (which is the Notion " upon which this *Paraphrase* proceeds), does not " agree with the Scope of our Saviour's Discourse in " this Place." In the mean while, I conclude, That, " *this* is THAT *Regeneration*, which is neces- " sary to *Adult* Persons, as *Nicodemus* was. " * I say, to *Adult* Persons; For it is to be noted, that we have all this while, been speaking of *Regeneration*, with a *View* only to *such*, and it is under *this View* that it is most commonly treated of in Scripture. The first Preachers of the Gospel were principally concerned with those who were to be brought over from *Judaism*, or *Heathenism*, to the *Faith* of the *Gospel*. When, therefore, they speak of *Regeneration*, they speak of it generally *as it relates* to such. But there is a Sense of *Regeneration*, in which it is common to *all Baptized* Persons, *Infants*

---

sion. 2. As *Grotius* hath observed, the Phrase of *Ascending into Heaven*, is, in other Places of Scripture, to be taken in the former Sense; *viz.* of *gaining Knowledge* from *God*. And, 3. If it is thus understood in this Place, then what our Saviour saith here, hath a clear Connexion with *ver.* 11. where he rebuketh the *Jews* for not believing his Revelations, taxing them with Unreasonableness for it, since he delivered nothing but what he had *seen* and *known* from God; and also with the precedent Verse, where, by the *Heavenly Things*, all agree those Doctrines are meant, which were to be known by Revelation, *Id.* p. 147.

as well as *Adult*; as well as a Senſe in which it is *peculiar* to the *Adult* only. The *Adult* only can be ſaid to be *Regenerate*, as that Word implies under it, a *Change* of *Mind* from *Evil* to *Good*, or a Conformity of the *Will* and *Affections* to the *Commandments* of Chriſt *(p)*. But the Word *Regenerate* (as has been ſhewn) is in Scripture ſometimes uſed to denote that *Relative State* which a Man ſtands in towards God *as the Diſciple* of Jeſus Chriſt; and, conſequently, *thus far*, or *in this Senſe*, every *Diſciple* of Jeſus Chriſt, *i. e.* every Perſon who has been received as a Member of Chriſt's *Church* by † *Baptiſm*, is *Regenerate*. †

(p) To be Regenerate, or Born again, (as that Phraſe denotes the State or Condition of the Mind) ſeems, indeed, to have a peculiar Reference, not only to *Adult* Perſons, but alſo to *ſuch* Adult Perſons, as have been brought over from *Infidelity* to *Chriſtianity*. For *Regeneration* (as has before been obſerved) refers back to ſome *precedent* State, *different* from that which we are in at preſent. When, therefore, we apply the Word to the *Conformity* of the *Will* to the *Commandments* of Chriſt, without any regard to ſuch a *Change*, the *Propriety* of the *Metaphor* is, indeed, loſt; but the thing ſignified or intended by it, continues to be the very ſame.

DIS-

DISCOURSE I.

Concerning REGENERATION,

OR,

The NEW BIRTH.

PART II.

Wherein the Notions of ſome Modern Divines upon this Subject, are examined and refuted.

§. I. * HAVING ſhewn you in the foregoing Part of this Diſcourſe, what the Scripture means by being *Regenerate* or *Born anew*; I now proceed to examine thoſe Notions concerning it, which have been entertained by ſome Modern Divines. And this I am the more willing to do, becauſe I perſuade my ſelf, that when once the Reader comes to perceive what Extravagancies have been introduced upon this Subject; he will be the more readily diſpoſed to acquieſce in that eaſy and familiar Idea of *Regeneration*, which has already been laid before him. Some

Some have fancied, that the *New Creature* is (*q*) *a certain Principle of New Life infused by the Spirit of God, which* Principle *has a Being and Subsistence of its own in the Soul, and is super-induced to the essential Faculties of it*; that is, (for this they must mean, if they mean any thing) that the *New Creature* is not any *Property* or *Quality* belonging to the *Soul*, or the Soul *endued* with new Properties and Qualities; but that it is a *real Substance* distinct or different from the Soul. Now, it being evident, that there is nothing either in Reason or Scripture which has any Tendency to shew, that there is in *Man* any *real Substance* besides *Soul* and *Body*, this Notion appears, at first sight, to be a pure Dream of *Enthusiasm*; and, therefore, I shall have no farther regard to it, than as to what falls in in common with that other which I am now going to mention, *viz.* That *Regeneration* consists in the having (*r*) *supernatural Habits* (of Holiness) *infused into the Soul by the Operations of the Spirit*; which supposes (what, indeed, they seem also plainly enough to (*s*) assert) that the *New Birth* is not a *real Substance*, but a certain *Affection* or *Disposition* of the Soul, by which it becomes *better* than it was before. This Account, as it might be explained, I could very readily agree to; not, indeed, as setting forth the *Whole* of what the Scripture means by being *born again*. For, you must

(*q*) Dr. *Owen* and his Followers. See Dr. *Claget*, Par. 1. Chap. 3. Sect. 1.

(*r*) Conversio Habitualis seu passiva fit per *habituum supernaturalium infusionem* a Spiritu Sancto —— Illa REGENERATIO dicitur, quia se habet *ad modum* novæ Nativitatis quâ Homo reformatur ad Imaginem Creatoris sui. *Turretin*, Loc. 15. *Quæst.* 4. Sect. 13.

(*s*) *Novum Cor* dicitur fieri in nobis non *Physicè* sed *Ethicè*; quia *eadem substantia* qua infecta fuit peccato debet *restaurari* per gratiam. *Id.* Loc. 9. *Quæst.* 11. Sect. 5.

observe,

obſerve, that this goes no farther than to define what *Regeneration* is conſidered as an *internal Effect* of the Spirit's Operations; whereas (as I have ſhewn) the intire Scripture Notion of it, beſides that *inward* Change which is wrought in us by the Spirit, includes alſo that Change in our *Relative State* to God, which is the Conſequence of our being Baptized. But omitting this, I ſay, the Words will bear a very ſound Senſe; foraſmuch as that *Change* of Mind, which is ſignified by the Word *Regeneration*, as it denotes an *internal Effect*, may well enough be expreſſed by the *Infuſion* of *ſupernatural Habits*. But, as near as this Account ſeems to come to the Truth, it is, nevertheleſs, widely diſtant from it, both with reſpect to the *Nature* of the Thing defined, and alſo with regard to the *Way* or *Manner* according to which it is ſuppoſed to be effected. This I ſhall now make appear, by ſhewing, 1. What they teach concerning theſe *ſupernatural Habits*, in the receiving of which *Regeneration* is by them ſuppoſed to conſiſt. 2. What they mean when they ſay, that theſe *Habits* are *infuſed*.

§. II. Firſt, then, I am to inquire, What theſe Divines teach concerning thoſe *ſupernatural Habits*, in the receiving of which *Regeneration* is by them ſuppoſed to conſiſt; whereby I do not propoſe to give you a preciſe Account of what they *mean* by theſe *ſupernatural Habits*: For this is abſolutely impoſſible, unleſs it be poſſible to aſſign *their* Senſe of a Word, who, by the manner in which they apply it, do plainly ſhew, that they do not underſtand what they would have themſelves. That which a reaſonable Man would underſtand by a *Habit*, I conceive is this: That it is a prevailing *Bent* or *Inclination* of the Soul, by which a Man (ſuppoſing him to have the free Uſe of his rational Faculties) is either *always*, or *for the moſt part*, determined

termined to one particular way or manner of Acting. In this latter Case, *i. e.* when a Man is *for the most part* only determined to any one particular way or manner of Acting, the *Habit* is *imperfect*; but it is *perfect*, when this *Determination* is *even* and *uninterrupted:* In which Sense, therefore, a Man may be said to have attained to a *Habit* of *Holiness*, when he is under such a *constant* and *regular Inclination* to Vertue, that he will not, upon any Occasion, when he has Time to reflect and consider upon what he is about, deviate from the Rule or Measure of his Duty. And who will say, that a Christian thus disposed, is not in a *Regenerate* State? But this is not what these Divines would have. For those *supernatural Habits*, by the *Infusion* of which (as they suppose) a Man becomes *Regenerate*, are *such* Habits as a Man may be possessed of, and yet not shew forth the *Fruit* or *Effect* of them in his Life and Conversation; *such* Habits as are so far from leaving him under a *constant* and *regular* Inclination to Vertue, that they are consistent with a State of the most *heinous* and *deliberate Wickedness*; yea, (what is more) such as the most *heinous* and *deliberate* Wickedness *cannot possibly* extinguish (*t*). What sort of *Habits* these must be, it is, I say, not very easy to understand, nor, withal, is it material to inquire. That which I would observe, as sufficient for my present Purpose, is this: That to say that *Rege-*

(*t*) *Actus* quidem peccaminosi non possunt subsidere cum actibus Justitiæ oppositis, *v. g.* Actus *Adulterii* cum Actu *Castitatis*; Actus *Incredulitatis* cum Actu *Fidei*; Actus *Odii* cum Actu *Amoris*; sed non *possunt* tamen *Itatum* ipsum excutere. Ita nihil obstat *Fidem* & *Charitatem* manere in Homine peccante. Sed —— quoad *Semen* non quoad *Fructum*; quoad *Habitum*, sed languentem & imminutum, non quoad *exercitium* & *operationes*, Id. *Loc.* 15. Quæst. 16. Sect. 43.

neration

neration consists in the receiving of something, notwithstanding which a Man may be in a State of *deliberate Wickedness*, is to suppose, that a Man may be in a State of *deliberate Wickedness* and yet all the while be *Regenerate*. And this is what these Divines do very plainly assert: For they tell us, That *(u) notwithstanding the Saints when they fall into heinous Sins, deserve to be shut out from the Kingdom of Heaven, yet, through the Mercy of God, they do not lose their Right to that Kingdom, nor do they cease to be in a State of* REGENERATION. *For the Grace of* REGENERATION *flows from the Spirit, who when he hath once implanted the quickning Seed in our Hearts, stamps upon it a Heavenly and Incorruptible Energy*, &c. The Case, you see, is evidently this, that according to them, the *Grace*

(u) Licet sancti per gravia in quæ incidunt peccata mereantur exclusionem à regno cœlorum——fit tamen Dei Misericordiâ ut propterea nec jus ad regnum cœlorum tollatur——nec status REGENERATIONIS *ableatur* effectivè. Quia——Gratia *Regenerationis* fluit à Spiritu, qui ut semen vivificum, semel in cordibus nostris implantavit, ita illi imprimit vim cœlestem & incorruptibilem, eandemque perpetuò fovet & tuetur, *Id. Ibid.* §. 41. *This Passage is borrowed from* Act. Synod. Dord. *Par.* 2. *p.* 251. *where we have these Words: Regeniti* quandoque suo vitio incidunt in atrocia peccata atque hinc—— reatum damnabilem contrahunt; præsentem ad regnum cœlorum ingrediendum aptitudinem amittunt —— Dei enim immota ordinatio postulat ut fidelis sic exorbitans per renovatum fidei & pœnitentiæ actum prius redeat in viam, quam ad viæ metam; *i. e.* ad regnum cœleste perduci possit.——In illo [itaque] interstitio quod est inter contractum ex gravi peccato reatum, & fidei ac pœnitentiæ actum renovatum, stat talis peccator suo merito damnandus —— [Interim vero] jus ad regnum cœlorum non tollitur; justificatio universalis non irrita redditur; status adoptionis manet immobilis ——Semen *Regenerationis* unà cum omnibus fundamentalibus donis, sine quibus hominis *Regenerati* status non consistit, sarta tecta conservatur——Spiritus [enim] Sanctus, qui hoc semen cordibus renatorum infundit, eidem semini vim imprimit cœlestem eandemque pepetuò fovet & custodit.

of *Regeneration* is *(w) Incorruptible*; insomuch, that he who is *once Regenerate*, must always be Regenerate. Yet they grant, that he who is *once* Regenerate, may fall into such *actual Transgressions*, as render him *unfit* for the *Kingdom* of Heaven, and for which, if he were to dye in them, he would certainly be *damned*; from whence it follows, that to be *Regenerate*, and to be in a State of *wilful Disobedience*, are consistent Things. To quality the Matter a little, they do indeed tell us, That the Sins which are committed by the *Regenerate (x)*, are committed only through *Impotency and Infirmity*; and there can be no doubt but that *Sins* of *Infirmity* (those I mean, which are *truly* and *properly* such) are consistent with a *Regenerate* State. But if you imagine, that they speak of *Sins* of *Infirmity*, as opposed to *wilful*, *deliberate* Sins, you will find yourself mistaken; for, besides that these are none of those Sins which will shut a Man out from the Kingdom of Heaven; they tell us plainly, that a *Regenerate* Man may be *(y) under the Dominion of Sin, as to the Act, and as to some par-*

(w) Orthodoxi —— *Habitum* fidei semel electis indultum posse quidem interdum intendi vel remitti censent —— pro ratione peccatorum intercurentium; sed ita ut nunquam penitus & finaliter deleatur et amittatur, nec gratia *Regenerationis* semel homini collata penitus ab eo auferatur. *Id lb.* §. 7.

(x) Fideles non tam ex malitia & pleno voluntatis consensu peccant, quam ex *Infirmitate* & *affectuum Impotentia*. *Id. lb.* §. 34.

(y) Non negamus fidelem posse subesse nonnunquam regno peccati partiali; i. e. Quoad actum, & quoad *certa peccata* quibus *indulget*; sed negamus subesse regno peccati universali quoad statum, ut absolute in ejus potestatem veniat, & sine ullo *remissu* & *reluctantia* in illo dominetur. *Turretin.* Ibid. §. 46.

ticular

ticular Sins which he INDULGES; that he may *(z) concupiſcentiis ſuis libere turpiterque parere*, live under a *willing*, *filthy* or *ſhameful Subjection to his Fleſhly Appetites*; *that he may follow them with ſervile or a ſlaviſh Indulgence againſt the Motions of Grace, and the Dictates of his own Conſcience.* Accordingly, there is not a Sin you can name (nor ſcarce any of the moſt aggravating Circumſtances of it) which they do not allow to be conſiſtent with a *Regenerate* State. Not the *(a) Incontinency* and *Idolatry* of *Solomon*; not the *Adultery* and *Murder* of *David*, which he committed, ſay they, *(b) peſſimâ & deliberatâ Machinatione*, by a *moſt wicked and deliberate Contrivance*: In a Word, Not all thoſe *(c) Works of the Fleſh* which are mentioned *Gal.* v. 19, 20, 21. and of which the Apoſtle ſays, That *they who do ſuch Things, ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God.* But what, then, do they mean, when they ſay, That the *Regenerate* ſin only through *Impotency* and *Infirmity?* Why, only, That they

---

(z) Non deeſt quidem in nobis (ſc. Regenitis) per totum vitæ curſum motus & ductus Spiritus divini, ita tamen ut gratiæ deeſſe poſſumus, imo ut nimis ſæpè deſimus, ac ſubinde *concupiſcentiis noſtris libere turpiterque pareamus.* Hinc illa *Gal.* v. 17. *Spiritu ambulate & deſideria carnis non perficietis*, & *Eph.* iv. 20. *Nolite contriſtare Spiritum*, &c. Spiritum enim contriſtare dicuntur, qui ejus ductui reſiſtunt, & *ſervili quadam libertate* concupiſcentiis ſuis contra gratiæ motum & conſcientiæ dictamen *indulgent.* Act. Syn. Dor. *Par.* 2. *p.* 172.

(a) See Mr. *Turretin.* Loc. xv. *Quæſt.* 16. §. 29. *ad finem.*

(b) Act. Synod. Dor. *Ibid. p.* 175.

(c) De *Renatis* aſſerendum eſt [quod] — cum labuntur *potuerant* gratiæ vi & ſubſidio, per *voluntatem liberam* — concupiſcentiis ſuis reſtitiſſe & vitaſſe *opera illa carnis manifeſta* quæ *Gal.* i. 19. recenſentur *fornicationem, immunditiem*, &c. *Ibid.*

do not ſin (*d*) *maliciouſly*, *on purpoſe*, as it were, for ſinning ſake, *with a high Hand*, *without Reluctancy* before, or *Remorſe* afterward. So that, according to them, let a Man be guilty of as much Wickedneſs as he pleaſes, yet, if he does not wage open War with Heaven, and brave the Almighty to his Face, *i. e.* If he be not altogether as bad as the Devil himſelf, he may, nevertheleſs, be ſaid to be *Regenerate*.

§. III. This then, is the Point which I now fix upon; to wit, That in the Account of theſe Divines, *wilful*, *deliberate* Sin, is conſiſtent with a State of *Regeneration*; a Propoſition as contrary to the Word of God, as Light is to Darkneſs. For, Firſt, It contradicts thoſe Words of St. *John*, *Whoſoever is born of God, doth not commit ſin; for his Seed remaineth in him, and he cannot ſin becauſe he is born of God.* † "How ſhould this be a Reaſon why † *Par.* 1. *p.* 123. "a Man cannot ſin, *viz.* That the *Seed* of God "*remains in him*, that *he is born of God*, if he may "be guilty of notorious and wilful Sins, and yet "that Seed remain, and he be regenerate ſtill?" * * It is pretended, I know, that when the Apoſtle ſays of the *Regenerate* Man, that he cannot ſin, his Meaning is not, that he cannot *wilfully* ſin, but that he cannot *habitually live* or *continue* in Sin: And to this purpoſe, it is obſerved, that in the

(*d*) Qui opera carnis plenâ voluntate & *datâ operâ* patrant —rectè dicuntur à fide penitus deficere. Sed hoc ſenſu fideles non poſſunt peccare; quia non tam ex *malitiâ* & pleno voluntatis conſenſu *ſine reluctantia* peccant quam ex *infirmitate*, &c. Licet vero peccata illa non raro fiant ex prævia aliqua deliberatione & contra conſcientiam, quia tamen προάιρεσις illa non tam oritur ex habitu quam ex vehementi affectuum perturbatione in quibus eſt ſemper vel *antecedens luctus*, vel *ſubſequens dolor*, hinc patet non poſſe vocari peccata *nequitiæ* & *ſuperbiæ*, quæ fiunt *elatâ manu* & gratiam omnem ex corde excutiunt. *Turretin.* Loc. ſup. cit. §. 34.

fore-

foregoing part of the Verſe, (*e*) He doth not ſay, *Whoſoever is born of God, doth not ſin*, but *whoſoever*

(*e*) Non dicit ſimpliciter non *peccare* natum ex Deo, i. e. verum fidelem, ſed *peccatum non facere*, i. e. ita ut peccatum illi dominetur quo totus in diaboli poteſtatem regrediatur, eo modo quo peccant *irregeniti* cum *ſtudio* & *habitu* peccandi, peccato regnante. Ut *juſtitiam facere* dicitur non qui quodlibet opus juſtitiæ facit, ſed qui illi *dat operam* per continuum ejus exercitium; ut *medicinam facere* dicitur qui eam profitetur, & in ejus praxi verſatur, *mercaturam facere*, *aream facere*, qui eam exercet. *Thus Mr.* Turretin (*loc. cit. §. 23.*) *whoſe Interpretation is ſomewhat countenanced by our Learned* Dr. Hammond *in his Note upon the Word* Ἐμβλώπει (Matt. v. 9.) *where he obſerves, that the Word* ποιεῖν, *to* do *or* work, *in ſacred Dialect, doth oft ſignify the* Habit *or* Bent *of the Mind, with the conſequent* Actions. *So,* (ſays he) ἁμαρτίαν ποιεῖν, *to* commit *or* live indulgently *in Sin*; *and* ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην, *to have a* ſincere Inclination *or* Reſolution *of Mind towards* Righteouſneſs, *&c. That which the Doctor means, is, not that the Word* ποιεῖν inforces *or* ſpecifies *a* Habit (*for then it could ſignify nothing elſe*); *but that it is often uſed where a* Habit *muſt neceſſarily be* underſtood, *which is very certain. But where as he ſaith particularly, that* ἁμαρτίαν ποιεῖν, *in the Language of the Scripture, ſignifies,* To live indulgently in Sin, *I know not for what Reaſon he ſays it. He produces no Authority, nor, indeed, do I find that the Phraſe is ſo much as once uſed in this Senſe throughout the whole* New Teſtament. *The Phraſe occurs but Seven Times*; *once* 2 Cor. xi. 7. Ἢ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα; *Have I committed an Offence? i. e. Have I done an ill Thing,* in abaſing myſelf, *&c? Where it plainly denotes an* Act, *and not a* Habit. *Again* Jam. v 15. And the Prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the Sick — Κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκώς, And if he have committed Sins, they ſhall be forgiven him; *where the Phraſe is uſed* indefinitely, *and ſignifies* preciſely *neither an* Act *nor a* Habit; *for it is juſt as if the Apoſtle had ſaid,* If he be a Sinner, *he ſhall be forgiven. Once more* 1 Pet. ii. 22. Ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησε, Who did no Sin, neither was Guile found in his Mouth; *which Words being ſpoken of our* Lord, *ſignify, that he had committed no* Act *of Wickedneſs. The remaining Places are* John viii. 34. 1 John iii. 4, 8, 9. *which I ſhall conſider above, and ſhew, that they carry no ſuch Meaning. So that, upon the whole, I muſt look upon this as a Miſtake of the Learned Doctor; and that which ſeems to have led him (and I may add Mr.* Turretin *alſo) into it, is, that* ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην, *implies a* Habit. *But is not the Reaſon viſible?* To do Righteouſneſs *muſt needs imply a* Habit, *becauſe* Righteouſneſs *as a* Habit; *i. e. that which denominates*

ever is born of God, doth not COMMIT *Sin*, i. e. He doth not *habituate himself* to Sin; he doth not make Sin his *Trade* or *Employment*; *and he cannot sin, i. e.* (say they) he cannot *thus* sin, *because he is born of God.* But that this is the full Sense of the Place, can never be argued merely from the Force of the Words themselves. For tho' I do not deny that the Word ποιεῖν (upon which the main Stress of this Interpretation lies) is often used where a *Habit* must necessarily be understood; yet neither can it be denied, that it is as frequently, if not more frequently, used where *single Acts* are also spoken of. The Truth is, that this Word of *itself* denotes precisely neither an *Act* nor a *Habit*, but is *indifferently* applied to *either*; and, by Consequence, whenever a *Habit* is to be understood, this must appear not from the *Word*, but either from the *Nature* of the *Thing* spoken of, or from the *Circumstances* of the *Place* where the Word is used. To the first of these, *i. e.* to the *Nature* of the *Thing*, we cannot now appeal on either side;

---

a Man righteous, *is not* one single Act *of* Righteousness, *but the* constant Course *and* Tenor *of his Life. But tho'* one single Act *of* Righteousness *is not enough to denominate a Man* Righteous; *yet*, one single Act *of* Wickedness *is enough to denominate him* a Sinner. *But the Doctor hath taken care to set this Matter right in his Note upon the Text of St.* John, *now under Consideration*; *where he observes, that* ἁμαρτάνειν and ἁμαρτίαν ποιεῖν, appear to be directly the same. *And having put the Question, Whether these Phrases are to be interpreted only of an* Habit *of deliberate Sin, or belong to* one single Act *of it? he resolves it thus*; That tho' he that lives impenitently in any *Habit* of known Sin, be most eminently said *to sin*, and to *commit Sin*, yet he that is guilty of *any one deliberate Act*, is here primarily meant by these Phrases. *The Reasons he offers for this, are convincing, and shall be considered by and by. In the mean while it is evident, that in* Dr. Hammond's *Opinion* one single Act *of* wilful, deliberate Sin, *is inconsistent with a* Regenerate State. *And, in this Point, he agrees with* Grotius, *and some other Learned Commentators.*

because,

becauſe, *what this is*, is the Point under Conſideration; we muſt therefore be determined by the *Circumſtances* of the Place: And what is there, in the Words either going before, or following after, which has any Tendency to ſhew, that the Apoſtle intended to exclude *habitual* and *deſperately hardened* Sinners only, from a *Regenerate* State? Why here (ſo far as I can perceive) theſe Divines have little to ſay: But Dr. *Whitby* hath taken care to ſupply this Defect. He writes, indeed, in ſuch a Manner, as 'tis ſcarce poſſible to know which ſide of the Queſtion he is of: However, he has given it us in very plain Terms, "That he (*f*) cannot aſſent "to that Expoſition which ſaith, *A Child of God* "(*i. e.* a Regenerate Man) *cannot be guilty of any* "*great or deliberate Crime*;" and, accordingly, (with the Diſciples of *Calvin*) he explains the Phraſe ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, as ſignifying *one who lives or goes on in a way of Sin.* For this Interpretation, he has offered Three ſeveral Reaſons; which I will now examine in their Order.

§. IV. And, *Firſt*, the Doctor argues "from the "ſame Phraſe uſed in St. *John*'s Goſpel, *Chap.* 8. "*Verſe* 34. Πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, *Whoſoever com-* "*mitteth Sin, is the Servant of Sin.* Now (ſays "he) to be *the Servant* of Sin, is plainly to *conti-* "*nue* and *live* in Sin." But had not the Doctor ſo plainly told us what it is that he was going to prove, I ſhould verily have concluded, from his Way of Reaſoning, that it had been the direct contrary. To be *the Servant of Sin*, he tells us (in the Words of St. *Paul*, *Rom.* vi.) "is *to yield Obe-* "*dience to it in the Luſtings of it*, (Verſe 12.) for "then Sin *reigns in our mortal Bodies*, and we are

(*f*) Annot. on 1 *John* iii. 8.

" Slaves and Subjects to it; then doth it κυριεύειν " *Lord it over us*, and we are δοῦλοι εἰς ὑπακοὴν *Ser-* " *vants to yield Obedience to it* (Verſes 14, 16.) " Tho' the Conſcience may boggle at it, our Rea- " ſon may condemn it, our Will be ſomewhat " averſe to it; ſo that in obeying it, we *do the* " *Evil we would not:* yet, if ἐμπλακείσης ἡττώμεθα, " we are *ſo intangled as to be overcome by it*, we " are *Servants to Corruption*; *for of what a Man* " *is overcome, to that is he brought in Bondage*, " 2 Pet. ii. 19. 20. If *the Law of our Members* " *leads us Captive to the Law of Sin* (Rom. vii. 23.) " ſo that we *yield our Members Inſtruments of Un-* " *righteouſneſs to Sin*; we *ſo* commit Sin, as to be " the *Servants* of Sin." In theſe Words it is directly aſſerted, That every one is *the Servant of Sin* (and, conſequently, does ποιεῖν ἁμαρτίαν, *commit Sin*) who *yields Obedience to it in the Luſtings of it*; who is *ſo intangled as to be overcome by it*; who *yields his Members the Inſtruments of Unrighteouſneſs*. And is not this true of every *wilful, deliberate* Sinner? Certainly it is! For he who to gratify the *Luſtings* of the *Fleſh*, conſents to do what he knows he ought not to do, does thereby *yield Obedience* to the *Luſtings* of the *Fleſh*. He in whom *the Motions of Sin* do at any Time prevail above the *Senſe* of *Duty*, is *ſo intangled*, as to be *overcome* by Sin; and he who at any time conſents to *act unrighteouſly*, does hereby *yield his Members the Inſtruments* of Unrighteouſneſs. Theſe Characters, indeed, do moſt eminently belong to *habitual Sinners*, but they belong alſo to every *wilful* Sinner, tho' in a lower Degree. And what do we think was the Meaning of the Sacred Writers in thoſe Paſſages, where we are exhorted, not to *yield Obedience* to Sin; not to be *overcome* by it, and the like? Was it *merely* to guard againſt *evil Habits*, and not alſo againſt every *wilful Tranſgreſſion*?

Or

Or who would imagine, that even the Doctor himself was here describing the State of *habitual* Sinners, when he speaks of them as those *whose Consciences boggle* at Sin; whose *Reason condemns* them, and who, by obeying Sin, *do the Evil that they would not?* The Doctor, therefore, so far as I can perceive, is arguing all this while against his own Interpretation; which he does (if it be possible) yet more plainly in the following Words. For thus he proceeds; "He that is *born of God*, "CANNOT *thus sin*; because, by that *New* "*Birth*, he is *made free from* (the Service of) *Sin*, "John viii. 36. and become *a Servant to Righte-* "*ousness*, Rom. vi. 18. He hath that *Seed* with- "in him which *alienates* his Mind and Affections "from Sin, and that Spirit which causes him to "*mortify the Deeds of the* Flesh, *Rom.* viii. 13. *to* "*die to Sin*, and to *live unto God*, Rom. vi. 10." It would have been impossible for the Doctor to have said any thing more full to the Purpose, had he intended to shew, that all *wilful* Sin is inconsistent with a *regenerate* State. For with what Face of Truth can it be said, That he who *wilfully* and *deliberately* transgresses the Law of God, is *made free from the Service of Sin*, and become *a Servant to Righteousness*; that his *Mind* and *Affections* are *alienated* from Sin; that he is *dead unto Sin*, and *alive unto God?* He who *obeys* Sin (as every *wilful* Transgressor doth) is *the Servant* of Sin: For (as the Apostle speaks in this very Chapter, *ver.* 16.) *Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves Servants to obey, his Servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of Sin unto Death, or of Obedience unto Righteousness?* Such a one, by *consenting* to sin, shews, that his *Mind* and *Affections* are not *alienated* from Sin; at least, not *so far* alienated, as that he may be said to be *dead to Sin*, and *alive unto God*. For (to use the Words of the Apo-

Apoſtle once more upon this Occaſion) *How ſhall we, that are dead to Sin, live any longer therein* (Verſe 2.)? Or as it is *ver.* 1. How ſhall we *continue in Sin?* The Meaning of which is not (as the Doctor ſeems to fancy) that he who is *dead to Sin*, cannot *habitually* ſin, but that he muſt forthwith *ceaſe* to ſin, as a Man who is *naturally* dead, ceaſes from all *natural* Actions. But the Doctor's next Reaſon is ſtill more extraordinary; For, *Secondly*, he argues "from thoſe Words, *Neither can ſin*;" upon which he is pleaſed to obſerve, That "this "doth not imply that a good (or *regenerate*) "Man cannot be *overtaken* with a *Fault*," *i. e.* (for thus he explains himſelf) ſo as that "he ſhall not "be obnoxious to ſome *Infirmities* and *Wandrings* "out of the *Way*" (which is nothing to the Purpoſe;) "But the true Import of that Phraſe (ſays "he) is this; That he hath ſuch an inward Frame "of Heart, ſuch a Diſpoſition of Spirit, as ren-"ders Sin *exceeding odious* and *hateful* to him: "So that he cannot entertain the Thoughts of do-"ing it, or a Temptation to commit it, without "the *utmoſt Deteſtation*, and the *greateſt Horror*, "and ſo (pray mind it) can very rarely, and "ONLY through Surprize, or WANT *of due* DE-"LIBERATION, or thro' ſuch violent Tempta-"tions as PREVENT or HINDER his CONSIDERA-"TION, be obnoxious to Sin." ——— I will proceed no farther; ſuch broad Contradictions are not every Day to be met with. The Doctor's Buſineſs was to prove, that ποιεῖν ἁμαρτίαν, *to commit Sin*, ſignifies only to *live* or *go on* in a *Way* or *Courſe* of Sin, in Conſequence of his Principle, That a Man may be guilty of a *deliberate* Crime, and yet be *Regenerate*; and he proves it by ſuch a Reaſon, as ſhews, even in his own Opinion, that if a *regenerate* Man does ſin, it can *only* be FOR WANT of *Deliberation!* If there were any ſuch thing

thing as taking the Doctor at his Word, now is the Time that I would do it; and then we should have no farther Controversy upon this Point: For it would be agreed between us, that a *Regenerate* Man, *whilst such*, cannot be guilty of a *deliberate* Crime. But the next Reason sets us quite asunder again. For, *Thirdly* and Lastly, he argues "from "the Phrase, *He that committeth Sin* (Ὁ ποιῶν τὴν "ἁμαρτίαν) *is of the Devil*," Upon which the Doctor observes, with the same Pertinency as before, That "'tis not he who committeth *one* or *more* "Sins of *Infirmity*," that *is of the Devil*; and adds, "Nor he who commiteth one *great*," *i. e.* (for so the Opposition requires that it should be understood) one *deliberate* "Sin, through the Pow-"er of a strong Temptation, of which he bitterly "repents, and from which he returns to his Obe-"dience." But why doth the Doctor confound Things which ought to be distinguished? Would he say, that a *wilful Sinner* is not a Child *of the Devil*, after he has *repented* and returned to his *Obedience*? 'Tis granted; for then he *ceases* to be a *wilful Sinner*. But if he means, that a *wilful Sinner* is not a Child *of the Devil*, even *whilst he continues* to be such, *i. e. before* he has *repented* him of his Sin (which he seems to me to mean, and which he must mean if he would speak to the Point) this is what I shall demand of him to prove: And he proves it from hence, that "*David* "and St. *Peter* did thus" (*i. e.* committed great Sins through the Power of a strong Temptation) "and "yet (saith he) were not then the Children *of the De-*"*vil.*" Not then the Children *of the Devil!* What, not whilst they were in a State of *wilful Disobedience!* What, not *before* they had *repented* them of their Sins! Where did the Doctor learn this? Why, no-where that I can see; nor doth he believe one Word of what he says himself: For he tells us in

the

the very ſame Breath, that *They* are the Children *of the Devil*, "who comply with the *Luſts* of *Sa-*"*tan*, and *will do them.*" Either then it muſt be ſhewn, that *wilful Sinners* do *not* comply with the *Luſts* of *Satan*, which is palpably abſurd; or elſe the Doctor here bears Witneſs againſt himſelf, that *David* and St. *Peter*, whom he ſuppoſes (whether rightly, or not rightly, it matters not to inquire) to have been both *wilful Sinners*, were, *whilſt ſuch*, or *before* they *repented*, Children *of the Devil*. For ought I can perceive, therefore, the Doctor, even in Virtue of his own Reaſoning, muſt be obliged to admit *that* as the *true* Senſe of this Paſſage, which he hath rejected as a *falſe* one, *viz.* That *he that is born of God ſinneth not*, quamdiu renatus eſt, *whilſt he is born of God*, becauſe *he ceaſeth to be a Child of God when he ſins*. The Examples of *David* and St. *Peter*, whoſe *Faith* (ſays he) *failed not* under that great Miſcarriage, will not help him. For he knows very well, that *Faith without Works*, i. e. *Obedience*, is not enough to make a Man a *Child of God*. If therefore a Man fails in his *Obedience*, i. e. *wilfully* tranſgreſſes the Law of God; if he *complies* with the *Luſts* of the *Devil*, and *will do them*; we have the Doctor's own Word for it, that be he *David*, or be he *Peter*, he is at that Time *not* a Child *of God*, but a Child *of the Devil*. But the Doctor farther endeavours to confute himſelf by "the Words of the "Apoſtle, 1 *Joh.* ii. 1. *Little Children, if we ſin,* "*we have an Advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt* "*the Righteous, and he is the Propitiation for our* "*Sins.*" From hence he would infer, that a Man *may ſin*, i. e. (for this is the Point, and thus it follows in the very next Words) *be guilty of a great and deliberate Crime*, and yet at the ſame Time be a *Child of God*. For, ſaith he, Chriſt "is "only the *Advocate* for the *Sons of God.*" And

does

does then the Doctor believe in good earneſt, that Jeſus Chriſt is an *Advocate* for *wilful* and *deliberate* Sinners, *whilſt they are ſuch?* If not, what becomes of his Argument? And if he does, *I call Heaven and Earth to record againſt him*; the *Word* of *God*, and the *Reaſon* of *Man*; which both of them aſſure us, that he neither is, nor can be, an *Advocate* for any but the *truly Penitent*, i. e. thoſe who thro' the Aſſiſtance of the Divine Grace, have *recovered* themſelves from a *State* of *Sin*, to a *State* of *Obedience*. I ſhall conclude with one Paſſage more, in which the Doctor hath decided the whole Point againſt himſelf, as plainly as one could wiſh. "That Man (ſays he) who, after ſome Con-"teſt in his Soul, yields to the Commiſſion of "Sin, is more ſtrongly inclined to Sin, than to "the avoiding it, and ſo, IS NOT RENEWED." Here now is a very plain Confeſſion: 1. That no Man is *renewed* (i. e. *regenerate*) who is *more ſtrongly inclined to ſin*, than *to the avoiding it*. 2. That this is the Caſe of every one who *yields to the Commiſſion of Sin after ſome Conteſt in his Soul*, i. e. after Deliberation; which, if it does not amount to a plain Confeſſion that ALL *deliberate* Sins are inconſiſtent with a *regenerate State*, I muſt for Ever deſpair of knowing what does.

§. V. It appears, I ſuppoſe, by this Time, that the Doctor hath ſufficiently puzzled the Cauſe which he undertook to clear. Let us now ſee what Light the Apoſtle himſelf affords us towards underſtanding his own Meaning; and for this, we need go no farther back, than to the Beginning of the Chapter, of which theſe Words are a part. At the 1ſt Verſe, he puts us in mind of the great Love of God the Father towards us, in the Redemption which he hath wrought for us by his Son Jeſus Chriſt; *Behold what manner of Love the Father*

Father hath beſtowed upon us, that we ſhould be called the Sons of God. Beloved, now are we the Sons of God. In the following Words, he ſhews us, the great Benefit and Advantage of this *Sonſhip*, which is the bleſſed *Viſion* and *Enjoyment* of God; *It doth not appear what we ſhall be: but we know that when he ſhall appear, we ſhall be like him, for we ſhall ſee him as he is*, (verſe 2.) After this, the Apoſtle obſerves the *Effect* which this Conſideration will have upon the Lives and Converſations of thoſe who are diſpoſed earneſtly and ſeriouſly to lay it to Heart. *And every Man that hath this Hope*, who lives under a conſtant Expectation of this Enjoyment of God, *purifieth himſelf*; and that, ſo far as the Condition and Circumſtances of Human Nature will permit, *even as he is pure*, (verſe 3.) Then he ſhews us wherein this *Purity* doth conſiſt, *viz.* in an univerſal *Obedience* to the *Commandments* of God, or in the *abſtaining* from all manner of *Sin*. For *whoſoever committeth Sin, tranſgreſſeth the Law; for Sin is the Tranſgreſſion of the Law*, (verſe 4.) which whoſoever is guilty of, he contradicts the End and Deſign of our Saviour's Coming: For, *ye know, that he was manifeſted*, or appeared in the Fleſh, *to take away our Sins*, i. e. (as it is *verſe* 8.) *to deſtroy the Works of the Devil*, that in us there might be no Sin, even as *in him is no Sin*, (verſe 5.) *Whoſoever*, therefore, *abideth in him*, i. e. whoſoever is a true Diſciple of Jeſus Chriſt, and, as ſuch, maketh his Law the Rule of his Converſation, *ſinneth not*; *whoſoever ſinneth, hath not ſeen him, neither known him*, i. e. not to any Effect or good Purpoſe, (*verſe* 6.) All which, that it might leave the more ſtrong and laſting Impreſſion upon our Minds, is inculcated with ſome Earneſtneſs, *verſ.* 7. *Little Children, let no Man deceive you: He that doth Righteouſneſs*, he, and he only, *is righteous.*

It

It is not *Faith*, or any thing elſe, that can make us *Righteous* before God, nor juſtify the Character of our being his *Children*, without *Obedience* to his *Commandments*. For, as it follows, *verſ.* 8, 9. *He that committeth Sin*, is not *born of God*, is not a *Child* of God, but a *Child of the Devil*. Thus ſtands the Context: From the Whole of which, it appears, That the Apoſtle was all the while exhorting Chriſtians to *abſtain* from *Sin*, to the Intent that hereby they might approve themſelves the *Children* of *God*, and intitle themſelves to the *Hope* of *Everlaſting Life*. The Point now is, of *what Sin* the Apoſtle ſpeaks; whether of *habitual* Wickedneſs *only*, or of *actual* and *deliberate* Tranſgreſſions *alſo*: And this is ſo eaſy a Queſtion, that 'tis impoſſible, one would think, that there ſhould be any Miſtakes about it. It is of *Actual* Sin that he ſpeaks, *verſe* 4. where he ſaith, That *Sin is the Tranſgreſſion of the Law*. It is of *Actual* Sin that he ſpeaks alſo, *verſe* 5. where he ſaith, That Chriſt was *manifeſted to take away our Sins*: For, as Dr. *Hammond* notes, "He came to take away our "*Acts*, as well as our *Habits*, and there was no "*Act* as well as no *Habit* of Sin in him." From whence he very rightly infers, That "in all that "follows, *verſ.* 6, 8, 9, &c. one *Act* of Sin is con- "trary to *abiding in* Chriſt, *i. e.* to adhering to "him; to *ſeeing* and *knowing* him, *i. e.* to obey- "ing him. One *Act* is *of* or *from* the *Devil*; one "*Act* is contrary to that *Seed*, that *Purity*, that "Principle of *Filiation* that is in him that is *born* "*of God*, and not only an *Habit* of it." There is not the leaſt Sign that the Apoſtle any where changes the Senſe of his Terms; and how abſurd is it to ſuppoſe, that in diſſuading Men from every *Actual* Sin, he ſhould have recourſe to an Argument which concludes only againſt *Habitual*? But, I muſt farther and particularly obſerve, that the

Apoſtle

Apoſtle ſays not only *negatively*, that he that is *born of God*, *doth not commit Sin*; but alſo *poſitively*, that he *doth Righteouſneſs*. For thus, *verſe* 10. *In this the Children of God are manifeſted, and the Children of the Devil*; i. e. This is that by which the *Children of God* are *diſtinguiſhed* from the *Children* of the *Devil*; *Whoſoever doth not Righteouſneſs, is not of God.* And on the other Hand (*Chap.* 2. *Verſe* 29.) *Every one that doth Righteouſneſs is born of him.* To *do Righteouſneſs*, therefore, (ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην) in the Apoſtle's Account, is the eſſential, ſpecific Character of a *regenerate Man*. And what is it to *do Righteouſneſs?* Why thoſe ſhall anſwer for me who ſay that ποιεῖν ἁμαρτίαν ſignifies to *ſin* habitually; that it is to *do good*, or to *keep the Commandments of God* habitually. But if none are *Regenerate* but thoſe who are *habitually good*, how can it be true that none are *Unregenerate* but thoſe who are *habitually evil?* Is there no *Medium* between theſe two *Extremes?* Or, is a Man as ſoon as he removes from a *Habit* of *Vice*, immediately ſettled in a *Habit* of *Vertue?* The Mind of the Apoſtle is certainly clear to thoſe who are willing to underſtand him. According to him, none are *Regenerate*, but thoſe who are under ſuch a conſtant Senſe of their Duty, ſuch lively and vigorous Inclinations to Holineſs, as that they cannot at any Time knowingly and wittingly offend. Theſe only are thoſe who can be ſaid to *do Righteouſneſs*, even thoſe who have gained an intire Victory over the World and all its Temptations: For this is another Character which the Apoſtle hath given us of the *Regenerate* Man, *Chap.* v. 4. *Whatſoever is born of God, overcometh the World.* What does he mean by this? Is it *no more* than that the *Regenerate* Man is got above the *Predominancy* of evil *Habits?* Surely, not! For theſe Words are given as a Reaſon for what

what went before, *viz.* That *the Commandments* of God *are not grievous. This*, says he, *is the Love of God, that we keep his Commandments, and his Commandments are not grievous. For whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the World:* As if he had said, "It is no hard or difficult Thing for those who are "*born of God*, to keep his Commandments, be-"cause such have overcome the World." Now, by *keeping God's Commandments*, the Apostle undoubtedly meant, the abstaining from all *actual* and *wilful Violations* of God's Commandments; and what Propriety is there, in order to shew, that it is no hard Matter for a Man to do this, to alledge *only*, that he is under such a *Temper* or *Disposition* of Mind, as will not permit him to break God's Laws *habitually?* He that ventures upon any one Act of *wilful Sin*, does thereby shew, that the *Commandments* of God *are grievous*; so that if, nevertheless, he may be said to have *overcome the World*, it must be said likewise, That altho' a Man has *overcome the World*, yet *the keeping* of God's *Commandments* may be grievous, which is contrary to the Apostle's Supposition, and takes away the Force of the whole Argument. The Inference, therefore, to make it just, must be thus; That it is no hard Matter for one that is *born of God* to keep God's *Commandments*, because such a one hath got the *Mastery* over *that* which *alone* can at any Time *prevail* upon a Man to do a wicked Thing. He hath such a sincere *Love* and *Affection* towards God; such *Hopes* of his *Mercy*; such *Fears* of his Vengeance; and, in Consequence hereof, such an *inward Conformity* to the *Divine Will*; as will incite him *more strongly* to *Obedience*, than either the *Pleasures* or the *Troubles* of this World *can* to the contrary. To such a one as this, the *Commandments* of God will not indeed be *grievous*; *i. e. comparatively*, and with respect to *Sin*, which

under any Circumſtances, will to *him* be *much more* grievous. Of ſuch a one it may truly be ſaid, That *he cannot Sin*; *i.e.* He cannot with *Knowledge* and *Deliberation* conſent to any *one Act* of *Sin*; for he who doth thus, doth thereby ſhew, that his *inward Diſpoſition* to *Obedience*, is *leſs powerful*, than the *Temptations* of this World, *i.e.* That he hath *not* overcome the World, but is overcome *by it*.

§. VI. I will now leave it to any Reaſonable Man to determine, whether that Doctrine which ſuppoſeth *wilful Sin* to be conſiſtent with a *Regenerate State*, doth not contradict the Account which St. *John* has given us of the *New Birth*; and will add, *Secondly*, That it alſo contradicts all thoſe Places of Scripture, which ſpeak of *Regeneration* as that which *qualifies* us for the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*. Our Saviour tells us, that *except a Man be born again, he cannot ſee the Kingdom of God*; which implies, That to be *born again*, is not only *neceſſary*, but *ſufficient* alſo, to qualify us for the Kingdom of God. St. *Paul* tells us, That we *are ſaved by the waſhing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt*; *i.e.* (as has been already ſhewn) by *Baptiſm*, and that *inward Change* from *Evil* to *Good*, which is wrought in us by the *Operations* of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and St. *John* ſpeaks of the *being Born of God*, or the *Children* of *God*, as the *Foundation* of the *Hope* that we ſhall hereafter be admitted to the Viſion of God. How then can *Regeneration* be conſiſtent with *wilful*, *deliberate* Sin, which ſo long as it remains unrepented of, every one knows, *unqualifies* us for the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*? Or how do they not contradict the Scriptures, who tell us, That a Man may be *unfit* for the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*, and yet be *Regenerate*? Now this is what theſe Divines do expreſsly teach. For, they tell us, That when the *Regenerate*

rate fall into *heinous* or *deliberate* Sins, they do (*g*) *præsentem ad Regnum Cœlorum ingrediendum aptitudinem amittere*; *i. e.* That *for the present*, or until they have done away these Sins by Repentance, they are *unfit to be admitted into* the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*; that they do *mereri exclusionem*, deserve to be *excluded*, or *shut out* from it; that they stand *suo merito damnandi*, which, in plain *English*, is, That they are in a *damnable State*. But, what! Could our Saviour undertake to shew us the *Way* to *Heaven*, and yet prescribe such a *Method*, as might leave those who should pursue it, in a *damnable State*? Does a Man *deserve to be excluded* from the Kingdom of Heaven who has *that* by which, as St. *Paul* says, he is saved? Or, can *he* be *unfit* for the Kingdom of Heaven, who, as the Words of St. *John* do manifestly imply, hath a just Foundation whereupon to build the *Hope* of *Eternal Life*? I know they tell us, That notwithstanding the *Regenerate*, on the Account of those heinous Sins which they are supposed to be under, are unfit for the Kingdom of Heaven, and in a *damnable State*, yet they have, all this while, a *Right* to the Kingdom of Heaven. But that a Man's having a *Right* to the Kingdom of Heaven, should be consistent with his being in a *damnable State*, is to me absolutely unintelligible. To say, that a Man is in a *damnable State*, is to say, that in *Justice*, or according to *Right*, he may and ought to be condemned; and to say, that a Man has a *Right* to the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*, is to say, that in *Justice*, or according to *Right*, he *ought* to be *admitted into* the Kingdom of Heaven; which Propositions being directly contradictory, cannot therefore be truly affirmed of the same Person, at the same Time. To have a *Right* to the Kingdom

(*g*) See the Citation above [*u*]

of Heaven, and to be *fit* for the Kingdom of Heaven, are equivalent Expreſſions: For, we have a *Right* to the Kingdom of Heaven no otherwiſe than in Virtue of the *Promiſe* of God in *Jeſus Chriſt*: This *Right*, therefore, muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe a *Performance* of the *Conditions* upon which the *Promiſe* is made. Now, the *Performance* of theſe *Conditions*, is that which *qualifies* or *fits* us for the Kingdom of Heaven; and, conſequently, he who is not *qualified* for the Kingdom of Heaven, has no *Right* to the Kingdom of Heaven. This (if they would attend to it) they would find to be true, even upon their own Principles. For tho' they tell us, that a *Right* to the Kingdom of Heaven is not founded upon the (*h*) *Actions*, *i. e.* the *Qualifications* of Men, but upon God's *free Adoption*, *i. e.* upon his *Abſolute Decree*; yet, they do not ſuppoſe this *Abſolute Decree* to be of ſuch a Sort, as that God hath *determined* thereby to ſave *this* or *that* particular Perſon, whether *penitent* or *impenitent* (upon which Principle, 'tis plain, that as the *Regenerate*, whom they ſuppoſe univerſally to be God's *adopted Children*, would not loſe their *Right to the* Kingdom of Heaven by *wilful Tranſgreſſion*; ſo neither would they be in a *damnable State*). But their Notion is this, That God, who hath *decreed* them *abſolutely* to *Salvation*, hath alſo *abſolutely* decreed them to that (*i*) *Obedience*, without which he hath determined not to *beſtow*

(*h*) *Jus* noſtrum ad regnum Cœleſte non in *actionibus* noſtris, ſed in *gratuita Adoptione* —— Situm eſt. *Act. Syn. Dord. Par.* 2. *p.* 253.

(*i*) Dei immota ordinatio poſtulat ut fidelis exhorbitans. Per renovatum fidei ac pœnitentiæ actum prius redeat in viam quam ad regnum cœleſte perduci poſſit —— Impoſſibile eſt ut *David* electus pereat; Impoſſibile eſt ut ſimul *David* adulter & homicida, ſi mors illum oppreſſerit impœnitentem, non pereat. Sed hunc

beſtow Salvation. Suppoſing then, I ſay, that our *Right* to the Kingdom of Heaven was founded upon ſuch a *Decree* as this, yet ſince, according to this *Decree*, Salvation is not to be had without *Obedience*, 'tis evident, that ſo long as a Man remains in a State of *Diſobedience*, he can have no *Right* to Salvation *in Virtue* of this *Decree*. It may be ſaid, indeed, that God has determined, that he *ſhall have* a *Right*? but it cannot truly be ſaid, that he actually has it, unleſs you will ſay, that a Man may have a *Right* to a Thing which he cannot *claim* according to the *Nature* and *Conſtitution* of the *Decree*, upon which this *Right* is ſuppoſed to be founded. If thoſe Divines, therefore, would be conſiſtent with themſelves, they ſhould ſay plainly, That a *Man* may be *Regenerate* or born of God, and yet have *no Right* to the Kingdom of Heaven: But this is too ſhocking a Propoſition, and therefore, this Method has been thought of to ſoften it. But to little Purpoſe, as, I hope, I have now ſhewn you: And give me leave to add, That if there were any Ground for this ſubtile Diſtinction, it would not, in the leaſt, help them. For the Scriptures either ſay nothing, or they ſpeak of *Regeneration* as that which fits or qualifies us for Eternal Life. Suppoſe our Saviour had ſaid in the Affirmative, *If a Man be born again, he ſhall enter into the Kingdom of God*; would not any Mortal have underſtood him as ſetting down thoſe *Qualifications* which God requires on *our Parts*, in order to our Admittance into the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*? And does not his *Negative* way of ſpeaking, in common Conſtruction, amount to the

---

hunc nodum Divina Providentia & Miſericordia facile ſolvit curando, ut nemo electorum ex eo ſtatu moriatur, in quo á vita æterna juxta aliquam Divinæ Voluntatis ordinationem excluderetur, *Ibid.* p. 252.

ſame thing? What think you of St. *Paul*, when he ſays, that *according to his Mercy, he ſaved us by the waſhing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt?* Doth he not here very plainly ſet forth the Mercy of *God* as the *Ground* of our *Salvation*; and *Regeneration*, both *External* and *Internal*, as *Qualifications* by which we become *fit* and *proper Objects* of that Mercy? —— But, why do I urge? The Thing is plain enough of itſelf; and if Men be not over-run with Prejudices, they will need only common Senſe to enable them to ſee it.

§. VII. By this Time, I think, it pretty plainly appears, that the Notion which theſe Divines have framed to themſelves concerning *Regeneration*, is widely diſtant from that which the Scripture teaches. For, whereas they tell us, That a Man may be guilty of the moſt *heinous* and *deliberate* Sins, and yet, at the ſame Time, be *Regenerate*; the Scripture deſcribes the *Regenerate Man*, as one who *cannot* ſin, *i. e.* who cannot, with *Knowledge* and *Deliberation*, conſent to do a *wicked Thing*, having *overcome the World*; *i. e.* all thoſe Temptations by which Men are led to commit Sin. And this Point muſt be carried ſo far as to ſay, That unleſs a Man has gained ſuch an Aſcendant over his Paſſions, as to be willing, when God calls him to it, to part with every thing for the ſake of Chriſt and his Goſpel, he is yet *unregenerate*. For ſays our Lord, *If any Man come unto me, and hate not his Father and Mother, and Wife and Children, and Brethren and Siſters, yea, and his own Life alſo, he cannot be my Diſciple*; i. e. Unleſs he be ready to forego every Bleſſing or Advantage of this World, when the Uſe or Enjoyment of it comes to ſtand in Competition with *Obedience* to my Word, he cannot, *&c. For he that loveth Father or Mother more than me,*

is not worthy of me. And he that loveth Son or Daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his Cross, and followeth me, cannot be my Disciple; *i. e.* He cannot be my *true* Disciple: He cannot be one whom I shall approve and reward, *Luke.* xiv. 26, 27. *Mat.* x. 37, 38. Such Perfection doth the State of *Regeneration* imply! And so far is it from being true to say, that to *do wickedly*, and to be *Regenerate*, are consistent Things! Let it only be observed, (and it deserves well to be taken notice of) That as this *Denial* of Ourselves, this *Resignation* of *Life*, and the most valuable *Treasures* of it, is not a Duty *ordinarily* incumbent upon Christians, but (as has been said) upon those only whom God shall *call* to it; so to be *absolutely*, and in every respect, *qualified* for it, is not *ordinarily* necessary to a *Regenerate State*. A Man ought, indeed, to be always in as good a Preparation as he can, because he knows not how soon he may be called to Sufferings; and by how much the nearer he is come to such a compleat Victory over the World, by so much the more *perfect*, without doubt, the *Regenerate State* must be. But we must not make it *essential* to a *Regenerate State*, to be at all Times *absolutely prepared* against the *greatest Sufferings*; for, besides that upon this Foot it would be a very difficult Thing to assure ourselves that we are in a *Regenerate State*, it being so hard to know how such Sufferings will affect us before we feel them; besides this, I say 'tis evident, that the Gospel requires no such Qualification. The Promise of *Eternal Life* is made to those who *love God*, and *keep his Commandments*, which must certainly be extended to *all* who serve him *faithfully* in the *Station* they are in: For, to suppose that God hath made our Salvation to depend not upon what Men *actually*

do under thoſe Circumſtances in which he had placed them, but upon ſomething which they *might* or *would* do under thoſe Circumſtances in which he hath not placed them, is to make him a much more hard and ſevere Maſter than any of Ourſelves. If a Man behaves himſelf as a good *Civil Subject*, and it were *known* that he might be tempted to tranſgreſs by the Offer of a Sum of Money; tho' we ſhould upon this Account value him ſo much the leſs, yet, I conceive, we ſhould not think it right, ſo long as he doth his Duty, that he ſhould be *hanged*, or even debarred from the common *Privileges* of *Civil Society*. And thus much we may ſay of God, with much greater Reaſon, as he is infinitely more juſt and righteous in his Dealings, than Man, that he will, indeed, look upon us ſo much the *leſs perfect*, and *reward* us the *leſs*, by how much the leſs able we are to indure Afflictions for his ſake; but he will exclude none from Heaven, much leſs conſign them to Puniſhment, merely becauſe they are not qualified to indure thoſe Afflictions which he doth not think fit to lay upon them. This will be farther evident, if it be conſidered, that our *Ability* to *reſiſt* Temptations, is not *merely* from *Ourſelves*, but from the *Grace* of God aſſiſting and ſupporting us under them; and that God doth not give to *all* the *ſame* Abilities, nor yet to the *ſame Man* at *different Times*; but proportions thoſe *Temptations*, which, in the Courſe of his Providence, he ſuffers Men to fall under, to their *different* Abilities. This ſeems to be hinted at in thoſe Words of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* x. 13. *God is faithful, and will not ſuffer us to be tempted above what we are able*, &c. But it is inconteſtably clear from that Method which our Saviour made uſe of in training up his Diſciples, which was always to *accommodate* himſelf to their *Weakneſſes*; and leſt by being over-

bur-

burdened, they ſhould fall away, to take great Care not to lay any more upon them, than that *Degree* or *Meaſure* of *Proficiency* which they had made under him, inabled them to *bear*; as you may obſerve from *Mark* iv. 33. *John* xvi. 12. *Matt.* ix. 17. Now, if we are therefore *unqualified* to *reſiſt* Temptations, becauſe we want *that Strength* which God alone is able to give, and which he doth not think fit to give, we cannot ſo long be *obliged* to be qualified; but we muſt be *acceptable* to God (tho' not *equally*) under every Degree of *Perfection*, *i. e.* when we make a due Uſe of that *Meaſure* of *Grace* which he affords us, by doing that which is *proper* to the *Station* we are in. I will beg leave to ſay farther, That we ſhall entertain no unworthy Apprehenſions of God, nor indeed any but what the Scriptures themſelves do ſeem to warrant, if we ſuppoſe, that when Men are *eminently good* and *vertuous*, but labour under ſome notable *natural Infirmity*, it pleaſes him, out of his mere *Mercy* and *Goodneſs*, to ſecure them from the *Aſſaults* of thoſe *Temptations*, under which (tho' it may not be impoſſible for them to reſiſt them, yet) he foreſees they will be very apt *finally* to miſcarry; and, I think, verily, that a Chriſtian would not pray amiſs, nor, perhaps, contrary to the Intention of our Saviour, who ſhould offer up that Petition in the Lord's Prayer, *Lead us not into Temptation*, *&c.* in this Senſe, that God would both enable him by his Grace to reſiſt thoſe Temptations, which it ſhall pleaſe him to lay upon him, and alſo *prevent* him, by his good Providence, from *falling under* thoſe by which, thro' the Prevalency of ſome peculiar Infirmity in himſelf, he might be diſpoſed to make an ill Uſe of his Grace, *i. e.* to be *intangled* and *overcome*. Farther, what better Senſe can you put upon theſe Words of our Lord

Lord to St. *Peter*, Simon, Simon, *behold* Satan *hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as Wheat*; *but I have prayed for thee*, &c. than by supposing them to imply, that Christ by his Prayers had obtained, that the *Devil* might not have Liberty to try his *full Strength* upon that *truly good*, but, as yet, *weak* and *unstable* Man, lest hereby, his *Faith* might have failed, as his *Courage* and *Constancy* did very quickly after? Now, if God doth thus provide against the *Infirmities* of his Servants, it must be supposed, that those on the Behalf of whom he thus provides, notwithstanding they are not in a Condition to indure the *greatest* Sufferings, are, so long as they do their Duties in the Station they are in, in a State of Acceptance. For, to say, that they are not, is to destroy the very Notion of that *Mercy* and *Goodness* which the Case supposes, and to make God to act a very unaccountable Part, in *protecting* those by his good Providence here, for a Reason, upon which he will *reject* them hereafter. To conclude, we are strictly charged and commanded in the Gospel, not to lay *Stumbling-blocks*, *i. e.* the *Occasions* of, or the *Temptations* to, *Sin* in one another's *Way*; and that *for the Sake* of those *weak* Men, who by such Occasions, may be led aside from their Duty, and fall into Condemnation. A very plain Argument, that a Man may be in a State of *Acceptance*, although he be so disposed, as that under *certain Circumstances*, he would certainly *transgress*. For surely, there can be little Reason why I should be commanded not to be unto my *weak Brother*, *an Occasion of falling*, if his very *Weakness* were his Crime, *i. e.* if he were under God's Displeasure, even *before* an *Occasion* of *Falling* be ministred unto him. Here then I rest the whole Matter: Let every Man consider how he behaves himself in that Station of Life which God has assigned him.

If

If he finds himself unable to bear up against those Temptations which such a Station does *naturally* and *ordinarily* expose him to, the Case is but too plain, that he is yet *Unregenerate*. But if, on the other hand, the Sense of his Duty to God, and the Motives of a Life to come, do operate so strongly upon his Mind, that he is become *superior* to every sinful Lust and Affection; if he is assured of this by repeated Tryals; and, more especially, if he observes that he now proceeds *easily* and *chearfully* in his Duty, amidst all those Assaults by which he was formerly wont to be overcome, let him give God the Praise, and not doubt but that the Spirit hath wrought that good Work in him, which both for the present renders him acceptable to his Heavenly Father, and which, if he perseveres in unto the End, shall finally be rewarded. I say, if he *perseveres*: For this is the only Point now to be taken care of, even that he *loseth not the Things whereunto he hath attained*; a Thing which is, alas! more than possible. For that which has already been said, only shews, that *so long* as a Man is in a *Regenerate* State, *i. e.* so long as he is *so disposed* as to love *God*, and *Truth*, and *Heaven*, above all Things, he cannot *wilfully sin*; it has not the least Tendency to shew, that he who is *once* Regenerate, must *always* be Regenerate. This is the Doctrine of those whose Principles I am now considering; but which utterly contradicts both Reason and Revelation. If, indeed, *Regeneration* were what they would have it to be, it might, for ought I can tell, be an *indelible* Quality, because I know not what Quality that is which they call *Regeneration*. But if it be such a *vertuous Disposition* of Mind as I have been describing, Reason tells us plainly enough, that for lack of *Care* and *Watchfulness* over a Man's self, it is capable of being *lost*; and I will add (by the

the Grace of God) capable alſo of being *regained.* As for what is offered upon this Head from Holy Scripture, I need not now conſider it, having ſo largely purſued this Point upon another Occaſion (*k*).

§. VIII. Wherefore, to proceed. The Difference between the Scripture Notion of *Regeneration,* and that which is taught by theſe Divines, will ſtill be more viſible, if it be conſidered, That as on the one Hand they tell us that a Man may be in a State of *wilful, deliberate* Sin, and yet be *regenerate:* ſo, on the other Hand, they ſuppoſe, that he may live *conformably* to *all* the *Laws* of the Goſpel, and yet be *unregenerate.* The Words of Dr. *Owen* are very full to this Purpoſe; and, therefore, I ſhall here ſet them down. (*l*) REGENERATION, ſays he, *doth not conſiſt in a Moral Reformation of Life and Converſation:* For, *let us ſuppoſe ſuch a Reformation to be extended to* ALL *known Inſtances. Suppoſe a Man to be changed from Senſuality unto Temperance; from Rapine to Righteouſneſs; from Pride, and the Dominion of irregular Paſſions, unto Humility and Moderation, with* ALL *Inſtances of the like Nature which we can imagine, or are preſcribed in the Rules of the ſtricteſt Moraliſts: Suppoſe this Change to be laboured, exact, and accurate, and ſo of great Uſe in the World. Suppoſe alſo, that a Man hath been perſuaded and brought to it thro' the preaching of the Goſpel; ſo* eſcaping the Pollutions of the World thro' Luſt, *even* by the Knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, *or the Directions*

(*k*) Operations of the Spirit, *Chap.* 15.

(*l*) See Dr. *Claget,* Part I. Page 127, 128.

of

of his Doctrine delivered in the Gospel; *yet, I say,* ALL THIS *added unto Baptism, accompanied with a Profession of Faith and Repentance,* IS NOT REGENERATION, *nor do they comprise it in them.* These are strange Words! And I cite them not because they are Dr. *Owen*'s (to whom I determined, when I first undertook this Subject, not to pay any particular Regard) but because, so far as I can perceive, they express the Sense of the whole Party. Those of our *English* Divines, who sat at the *Synod* of *Dort*, seem plainly to have been of the (*m*) same Opinion; for *they* say likewise of the *Unregenerate*, That they may *escape the Pollution that is in the World, by the Knowledge of our Lord and Saviour*; that they may demean themselves *so*, as that *in Charity they ought to be looked upon as justified and sanctified.* Farther, that this *Change* of *Manners* may be *hearty* and *sincere*; insomuch, that the true Reason why they are not *finally justified*, is not because they *pretend* to those *good* Qualities which they have *not*, but because they do not *persevere* in those that they *have*. What better Description than this can you have of a truly *honest* and *vertuous* Christian? Or what greater Opposition can you conceive, than that which this Account of the *Unregenerate* bears to those Words of the Apostle before-mentioned, *Whosoever doth Righteousness, is born of God?* He who keeps *all* the Commandments of God, *i. e.* he who in *every Instance* conforms himself to the Gospel *Rule*, not upon a Principle of *Policy* and Worldly *Interest*, but from a Sense of his *Duty*, and upon the *Motives* of a *Life* to *come*, to the Belief and Expectancy whereof he is won over by the *Power* of God's *Word*; such a One, I

(*m*) *Vide* Act. Synod. *Dord.* Part II. p. 246, to 250.

say,

ſay, may, undoubtedly, in the Apoſtle's Senſe, be ſaid to *do Righteouſneſs*. Now all this, it ſeems, an *unregenerate* Man may do, and, by Conſequence, the *Contradictory* of the aforeſaid Propoſition, muſt neceſſarily be true; *Whoſoever doeth Righteouſneſs, is* NOT Regenerate or *Born of God*. Nor is this Account leſs contradictory to the Words of our Saviour, than to thoſe of the Apoſtle. For, let us ſuppoſe a Man to be in ſuch a State as is now deſcribed, and then I demand *What lacketh he* yet to *qualify* him for the *Kingdom* of *Heaven?* Without tarrying for an Anſwer, I ſhall venture to maintain, that he lacketh *nothing*; and they themſelves confeſs as much: For they ſay, that he lacketh nothing but *Perſeverance*. But he who lacketh nothing but *Perſeverance*, doth indeed lack *nothing:* For *Perſeverance*, in the very Notion of it, implies not an *Addition* of any *new* Vertues to the *old*, but only the *Preſervation* of, or *Continuance* in, thoſe to which a Man has already attained; and he that is in ſuch a State as that, if he ſhall *perſevere* therein, he will obtain Salvation, is undoubtedly at preſent, and ſo long as he remains in that State, *qualified* for Salvation. To ſay, therefore, of ſuch a Man, that he is *unregenerate*, is to ſay, in Effect, that a Man may be *qualified* for the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*, and yet be *unregenerate*; which directly contradicts our Saviour's Aſſertion, *Except a Man be born again, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*. So wide of the Truth is this Notion of Regeneration, in what View ſoever you conſider it! After all, I muſt not diſſemble, that this Account which they give us of the *Unregenerate*, is, at other Times, very frequently contradicted by themſelves. And no marvel; For what but *Contradiction* can be the *Effect* of *Contradiction?* Or how is it poſſible, that thoſe ſhould talk *conſiſtently*, who take upon

upon themſelves to defend Doctrines which are *inconſiſtent.* The Caſe, in ſhort, is this: Their Notion is, that the *Elect* (who, in their Account, are *alone* the *Regenerate* or *Children of God*) cannot *finally* fail, or *die* in *Impenitency.* Yet, they do not deny, but that it is poſſible, that thoſe, who *know the Way of Righteouſneſs*, and *do from the Heart obey the Form of ſound Doctrine*, may, thro' the Subtlety of the Devil, and the Want of Care and Watchfulneſs over themſelves, afterwards *depart from the Holy Commandment delivered unto them.* This, I ſay, they do not deny; becauſe, if they ſhould deny it, they would have Reaſon, Scripture, and the ſad Experience of the World againſt them. What then ſhall we ſay of ſuch? Are they, even whilſt they *are* in the *Way* of *Righteouſneſs*, in a *regenerate* State alſo? No, by no Means; for then it would be plain, that a *regenerate* Man *may* poſſibly *fail* or *die* in *Impenitency.* But how can thoſe *not* be in a *Regenerate* State, who ſincerely and heartily *keep God's Commandments*, and whom the Scripture every where ſpeaks of as the *Children* of *God*, and *Heirs* of *Everlaſting Happineſs?* Why, here lies the Difficulty, which is indeed inſuperable; and, therefore, when they come to ſpeak home to the Matter, and to ſhew how the *falling away* of ſuch is conſiſtent with their Doctrine of the Saints *Indefectibility*, then theſe *unregenerate* Men (as they call them) are ſet forth in another Light; then they are repreſented as (*n*) mere *Hypocrites*, as thoſe

(*n*) Certum quidem eſt etiam *non* Regenitos quædam honeſta & laude digna in rebus civilibus præſtare —— quæ tamen ex *Fide* & *bona Conſcientia* non procedunt, *Theol. Palatin.* in Act. Syn. *Dor.* Par. II. p. 177. See alſo Mr. *Turretin*, Loc. 10. *Quæſt.* 5. §. 2. Loc. 15. *Quæſt.* 15. §. 9. Loc. 10. *Quæſt.* 4. §. 28.

whoſe

whose (*o*) *Affections* are *inslaved* to this *World*; as hardened, impenitent, and the like. In a Word, they speak as if it were impossible that there should ever have been any such thing as *real Vertue* or *Holiness*, unless it be in those whose Holiness is made *compleat* and *perfect*, by a *final Perseverance*. Thus they go to Work; affirming and denying the same thing, as it were, in the same Breath; which is a plain Argument to me, that they themselves do feel the Weight of their own Burden: And how hard a thing it is to stand it out against the Evidence of Scripture, that he, who by the *Power* of *God's Word*, and the *Assistance* of his *Grace*, is led to pay a *Religious* Observance to *all* his Commandments, may yet be *Unregenerate*; which, in Effect, is to say, That tho' a Man has *all* those *good Dispositions* which the Gospel requires. Yet, he may all the while be never the *nearer* to the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*.

§. IX. I have now shewn you the Falshood of this Notion concerning *Regeneration*, with respect to the *Nature* of the *Thing defined*, or with respect to those *Habits* wherein *Regeneration* is supposed to consist. I come now to consider, what the same Divines do teach concerning the *Way* or *Manner* by which these *Habits* are conveyed into the Soul, or by which a Man *becomes* Regenerate. Now, as to this, they say, 1. That *Regeneration* is an *infused Habit*, i. e. it is put into the Soul *all at once*. And, 2. That this is done by the *immediate* Operation of the *Holy Ghost*, without any *Concurrence* or *Co-operation* on the Part of Man. 'Tis true, they tell us, That there are several

(*o*) *Theol. Britan.* Act. Syn. *Dor.* Par. II. p. 249.

Things

Things (*p*) *neceſſary* to be done on our Part, in *order* to our being *Regenerate*; and that God does not (ordinarily, at leaſt) effect the *New Birth* in us all at once, by *violent Snatches* and *Enthuſiaſtic Motions*, but *gradually*, and *in a manner agreeable to our Natures*. But if the Reader ſuppoſes them hereby to mean, that Regeneration *it ſelf* is a *gradual* Work, or that *Man* is in any Degree or Meaſure the *efficient* Cauſe of his own *Regeneration*, he will find himſelf miſtaken. For that which they aſcribe to *Man*, as the *efficient* Cauſe, and that which they ſuppoſe, that God, by way of Co-operation, effects in Man, not *all at once*, but by *Degrees*, is only ſomething by which the Soul may be *diſpoſed* or *fitted* for the Reception of *ſupernatural Habits*; i. e. it is not the *New Birth it ſelf*, but ſomething which is neceſſary by way of *Preparation* for it. That a Man may be *Regenerated*, ſay they, it is neceſſary that he attends

(*p*) Non quæritur an ullæ *neceſſariæ* ſint *diſpoſitiones* in homine quibus ad converſionem *præparetur*. Fatemur enim in *Spirituali* generatione non minus ac in *naturali* per multas *præcedaneas operationes* ad *Spiritualem nativitatem* perveniri; & Deum (qui opus iſtud non per raptos violentos vel motus enthuſiaſticos vult peragere, ſed modo noſtræ naturæ convenienti, & qui non *uno momento*, ſed *ſucceſſive* & *gradatim* illud promovet) uti variis *diſpoſitionibus* quibus homo paulatim *præparetur* ad gratiam ſalutarem recipiendam; ſaltem in vocatione ordinaria. Ita ut varii ſunt actus antecedanei & quaſi gradus *ad rem* antequam ad ſtatum *Regenerationis* perducatur, vel *externi* qui ab homine fieri poſſunt, quales ſunt *templum adire*, *verbum audire*, & ſimilia; vel *interni* qui a gratia etiam in cordibus nondum converſorum excitantur, quales ſunt *verbi propoſiti receptio*, *notitiæ voluntatis Divinæ*, *ſenſus aliqualis peccati*, *timor pœnæ*, & *deſiderium aliquale liberationis*. Sed quæritur an in ipſo converſionis *momento*, & quoad gradus *rei* homo habeat aliquid ex ſe quo cooperetur gratiæ effi aci. —— Nos legamus cum *Orthodoxis*, qui nullam cauſam *efficientem* propriè ſic dictam agnoſcunt quam *Deum ipſum* regenerantem. *Turretin.* Loc. 15. *Quæſt.* 5. §. 4.

upon the *Public Worſhip* of God; that he *hears* his *Word*, and the like. It is neceſſary likewiſe, that he *receives* the Word of God, *knows* his *Will*, has ſome *Senſe* of his own *ſinful Eſtate*, ſome *Fear* of *Puniſhment*, and ſome *Deſire* of *Deliverance*; which Diſpoſitions they aſcribe to the *Operations* of the *Holy Ghoſt*. But all this is not *Regeneration*; no, nor any *Part* of it: For, according to them, when all this is done, a Man is every whit as much *unregenerated* as he was before. The Matter is plainly this: Thoſe Diſpoſitions which they call *Preparatory*, are not ſuppoſed to be the *Beginning*; and the ſubſequent ones, the *Growth* and *Perfection* of a *Regenerate* State; for this were to make *Regeneration* a *progreſſive* Work, carried on by *various Acts*, both on the Part of *Man*, and on the Part of *God*. Whereas, according to them, *Regeneration* is *one ſimple undivided* Act of God *alone*; an *Act*, which being *once ſuppoſed*, the *Man*, who was wholly *unregenerate* before, (*q*) *may immediately and preſently be affirmed to be born of God*. So that the *New Birth*, in this Account, differs as much from thoſe *Preparatory Diſpoſitions*, as the *Form* of an *Image* differs from thoſe *Accidents* or *Qualities* in *Wax* or *Clay*, by Virtue whereof thoſe Bodies become ſuſceptible of ſuch a Modification; and a Man contributes to his own *Regeneration*, juſt about as much as he who *cuts* and *prepares Wood* for the making of a *Veſſel*, does to the *filling* it with *Water* afterwards. But theſe Miſtakes will eaſily be ſet right by the help of

(*q*) Per *Regenerationem* intelligimus non *quemvis* actum Spiritus Sancti, ad *Regenerationem* prævium vel tendentem; ſed *illum actum* quo poſito ſtatim rectè affirmetur, *Hic homo jam natus eſt ex Deo*. Theol. Britan. *Act. Syn. Dor.* Par. II. p. 159.

what

what has been already said. For if a *Regenerate* State consists in the being endued with *all* Christian Graces, and implies an *universal* and *sincere* Obedience to *all* the Commandments of Christ, as has been proved, it will then be plain, "That "† *Regeneration* doth, *in part*, consist of those "*Graces* which are *preparatory* thereunto;" because these *Graces* are a *Part* of that *universal Obedience*. By being *Regenerate*, a Man acquires many good Dispositions, which he had not whilst he was in a State of *Preparation* only; but he loseth none of those which he had: The *Regenerate* State implies both the *old* and the *new*; and, consequently, differs "from mere *Preparedness*, "no otherwise than as the *Whole* differs from a "*Part*; and the *prepared* Mind becomes *Regene-* "*rate*, not by a *total Change* of its present State, "but by an *Addition* of something that was "wanting before. Farther, since *Grace* and *Ver-* "*tue* increase by Exercise; and since the several "Vertues of a Christian do mutually assist each "other; it may be said, That those good Quali- "fications which the *Regenerate* Man was endued "with in his *prepared* State, are now *improved* to "greater *Perfection*; *Meekness* and *Humility*, v. g. "are more deeply rooted in his Temper, and "more conspicuous in his Behaviour: In his Con- "cern for *Heaven*, he is more *zealous*; as having "had some Experience of the Heavenly Life, and "being more sensible of the Vanity of Worldly "Things. In his *Prayers*, he is more *devout* and "*frequent*; in good *Meditations*, more *attentive* "and *permanent*; in holy *Resolutions*, more *satis-* "*fied* and *inflexible*; and in his whole Conversa- "tion, more *vigilant* and *circumspect*." There are, indeed, some good Properties belonging to a State of *Preparation*, which, instead of rising higher, do fall lower, when Men come to be

† *Claz.* Part II. p. 90.

thoroughly *Regenerate*. For Inſtance; "*Sorrow* " for *Sin*, although it be neceſſary to a good " Beginning, and, in ſome Degree, inſeparable " from the beſt State of a good Chriſtian in this " Life; yet, it cannot be increaſed, but will aſ- " ſuredly be abated by a thorough Converſion " from *Sin* unto *God*. In like manner, that *Fear* " of *Hell*, as it is diſtinguiſhed from the *Hope* of " *Heaven*, muſt, in Reaſon, be leſs troubleſome " to a true Convert, than it was at firſt: For, as " his Hopes grow bigger, his Fears muſt of Ne- * " ceſſity be leſs." * But the Reaſon of this, is, becauſe the *Goodneſs* of theſe *Affections* or *Properties*, does gradually *leſſen*, as Men come nearer and nearer to *Perfection* in the *Regenerate* State. To be *ſorry* for *Sin*, and *afraid* of *Hell*, whilſt we are yet under the Guilt of Sin, and, conſequently, in the State of thoſe *to whom Vengeance belongeth*, are, doubtleſs, good Properties, as they are very prevailing Motives to ſuch a *Change* of *Life* and *Manners*, as may intitle us to *Mercy* and *Forgiveneſs*. But when that *Change* is once wrought; tho' even then we have reaſon to be angry with Ourſelves, that we have ever offended God; yet, the Senſe of it cannot lie ſo heavy upon us, or be ſo afflicting to us, becauſe we have not the ſame Reaſons to be afflicted. Our Conſciences may, and certainly will, whenever we reflect upon our paſt Sins, *reproach* us as *ungrateful*; but our *Fears* cannot, or at leaſt, ought not, to *terrify* us as *loſt* and *miſerable*. We ought, indeed, to be *always* under ſuch an *Awe* of the Divine *Vengeance*, as will make us careful not to offend. But, to be *afraid* of *Hell* in any *other* Senſe, whilſt we are in a *reconciled* State, *i. e.* in that State which God hath promiſed *Forgiveneſs*, betrays either great Ignorance of our own Condition, or a Diffidence and Diſtruſt of that *Juſtice* and *Goodneſs*, by which

which we have been led to Repentance †. The Case, in a few Words, then, is this; That such *preparatory* Graces as are good *in themselves*, and equally useful in *all* Conditions, will be *improved* in those who are truly *Regenerate*; whereas those which are good *accidentally* only, or with respect to the *different Circumstances* of our State, must either *rise* or *fall*, grow *higher* or *lower*, as our Condition towards God is *worse* or *better*, more *dangerous* or more *safe*. " But, admitting this " Exception, we may, by what has been said, " discern what is the Difference between the *Pre-* " *pared* and the *Regenerate*, *viz.* That the *latter* " is endued with *all* those Christian Graces which " the other *wants*, which is the *principal* Differ- " rence; and he is also arrived to greater *Perfe-* " *ction* in those which are *common* to *both*." * So that now, I think, we may safely conclude against these Divines, That *Regeneration* is neither an *instantaneous* Work; nor is it effected by the *Spirit*, as the *sole* efficient Cause. For that those *Graces* or *Dispositions* which they call *Preparatory*, are *gradually* wrought, is certain, and they allow. They grant also, what is no less certain, that in Order to the Attainment of these *Dispositions*, MAN must *concur* by the Use of *external Means*, *i. e.* by the Use of *his own* Endeavours. *Man*, therefore, is plainly, *in part*, the *efficient* Cause of these *Preparatory Graces*. Now, if these *Preparatory Graces* do differ from *Regeneration* no otherwise, than as a *Part* differs from the *Whole*, he must, of Consequence, be, *in part*, the *efficient* Cause of *Regeneration*; and *Regeneration* will be a *progressive* Work, carried on by various *Acts* and *Operations* both of *Man*, and of the *Spirit* which dwelleth in him. The very first Dawnings of Grace in our Hearts; the most early and languid Motions towards Godliness, must be considered as

† *

the *Beginnings* of this *New Birth*; as the *Embryo* of the *Spiritual Man*, who will receive Growth and Increaſe by every *new* Improvement, 'till, at laſt, he becomes *perfectly formed*, by a total Subduction of the Fleſh, and an utter Abolition of the whole Body of Sin.

§. X. This Idea of *Regeneration* is ſo natural and eaſy, that 'tis wonderful to me how any one ſhould ever dream of *infuſed Habits*, eſpecially, ſince there is ſo little Countenance for it to be met with in the Holy Scriptures. For the moſt that I can find alledged, in order to ſupport this Conceit, is, the Uſe of certain *Metaphorical* Expreſſions, by which *Regeneration* (which, indeed, it ſelf, is a *Metaphorical* Expreſſion) is deſcribed; and between which, and the Thing deſcribed, they fondly imagine there muſt be a *proper* Reſemblance in *every* Particular. Thus, becauſe *Creation* in a literal Senſe is an *inſtantaneous Production*; therefore, they conclude, that *Regeneration* is ſo too, becauſe *Regeneration* is called the *New Creature*. But why would not my Argument be as good, if I ſhould ſay, that becauſe the *Natural Birth* is not effected *all at once*, but is *gradual* and *progreſſive*; therefore, *Regeneration*, or the *Spiritual Birth*, is progreſſive alſo? Much after the ſame manner it is, that they go about to prove that *Man* is not in any Degree the *efficient Cauſe* of his own *Regeneration* —— But theſe Arguments have already been conſidered in my former Treatiſe, concerning the *Operations* of the *Holy Spirit*, to which referring thoſe who deſire farther Satisfaction, I conclude with obſerving to my Reader, That the unkindly Aſpect which theſe odd and whimſical Notions about *Regeneration* have upon true Chriſtian *Piety*, is the great Reaſon why I have beſtowed thus much Pains in refuting them.

them. If *Regeneration* be an *infused Habit*, of such a Sort, as that *wicked* Men may *have* it, and *good* Men may be *without* it; 'tis plain, that we have then no Rule by which we can, with any manner of Certainty, satisfy our selves whether we be in a *Regenerate* State, or not. For how shall we know whether we *have* these *infused Habits?* Not from the *Scriptures*; for these no-where speak of any *infused Habits*, nor have they left us any other Rule whereby to discern the *inward Operations* of the Holy Ghost, than the *State* and *Condition* of our own Hearts, with respect to *Vertue* and *Piety*. To describe *Regeneration*, therefore, in such a Manner, as that a *vertuous* and a *holy Life* shall be no sure *Sign* that a Man *has* it, nor *Wickedness* that he has it *not*, what is it but to take Men off from the *Word* of *God*, as the *Touch-stone* by which to try and examine the State and Condition of their Souls, and to send them to the *Suggestions* of the *Devil*, or the *Delusions* of their own foolish or wicked *Imaginations?* 'Tis, certainly, too great an Encouragement to *Vice*, to be told, that tho' a Man be in a State of *wilful, deliberate Sin*, he may yet be a *Child of God*; and a no less Discouragement to *Vertue*, to be taught, that tho' he has all those good *Dispositions*, which the Gospel recommends, he may be *unregenerate*; more-especially, when it is said withal, that a Man becomes *Regenerate*, as it were, by a *sudden* and *violent Snatch*, which is supposed to be the *Effect* of a *Power* with which he himself does not in the least *co-operate*, and which is absolutely *irresistible*. What Encouragement can He have to *labour* to *mortify the Deeds of the Body*, who believes, that his Sins, how great soever they be, cannot destroy his *Sonship*, nor cancel his *Right* to the Kingdom of Heaven? Who, if he can be so absurd as to *separate* his having a *Right* to the

Kingdom of Heaven, from his being *qualified* for the Kingdom of Heaven, is yet ſo conſiſtent with himſelf, as to be perſuaded, that that *inward Principle* which his Wickedneſs cannot *extinguiſh*, and which is inſeparable from a *Right* to the Kingdom of Heaven, will, at ſome Time or other, *qualify* him for the Kingdom of Heaven, *effectually*, and in ſpite of all *Oppoſition*? When they have made the moſt of it they can, it will, I fear, comparatively, be but very ſmall: But, aſſuredly, thoſe Principles take away all *Comfort* from the *Good* Man, who may not be diſpoſed to preſume more confidently in Favour of himſelf, than the Senſe of his own *Integrity* and *Uprightneſs* will carry him. Such a one as this, can never know that he is in a *Regenerate* State; and with how much the more Evenneſs, Conſtancy, and Regularity, he hath gone on in a Courſe of *Vertue* and *Piety*, by ſo much the leſs likely will he be to know it, ſince he muſt be by ſo much the leſs ſenſible of any *ſudden* and *violent Change* that hath happened at any Time within himſelf. And, as he cannot know that he is *now* Regenerate, ſo neither can he tell, that it will *ever* be *poſſible* for him to be ſo, becauſe it is not poſſible that he ſhould be ſo, but by an *irreſiſtible Operation* of the *Spirit*, to which ſome Perſons are immutably *elected*, and from which all the reſt (without any Regard had to their Qualifications) are immutably *reprobated*. And ſo much for the Point of *Regeneration*.

DIS-

DISCOURSE II.

Of SAVING,

OR

JUSTIFYING FAITH.

§. I. THE Doctrine of *Regeneration* being now, as I think, very clearly and fully ſtated; it will be proper to proceed to ſome other Queſtions which have a near Relation to it: the firſt and Principal whereof, is that concerning JUSTIFICATION. And there being (as is allowed on all Hands) ſo cloſe a Connexion between theſe Two, that whoſoever is *Regenerate*, is alſo *Juſtified*, and whoſoever is *Juſtified*, is alſo *Regenerate*; there ariſes to us this Advantage, That as by determining the firſt Point, we muſt neceſſarily have gone a great way in determining the latter; ſo the latter alſo being rightly reſolved, it muſt very much confirm and ſtrengthen what has been advanced upon the former. This Queſtion, indeed, could

could have required no distinct Consideration (or, at least, there would have needed very little to have been said about it) were it not for those Obscurities which have been cast about it by *Calvin* and his Followers. For, if he who is *Regenerate*, is also *Justified*, 'tis plain, that, if once I understand what that is by which, or in virtue whereof, I become *Regenerate*, I must, at the same time, understand what it is by which I am *Justified*. And this hath already been shewn to be *Faith* in *Christ*, and *Obedience* to his *Commandments*. But that which hath created so much Difficulty upon the Subject, is this, That St. *Paul* has somewhere taught us, That *a Man is justified by Faith, without the Works of the Law*; and that, *by the Works of the Law, no Flesh shall be justified*; which Assertions these Divines have so understood, as intirely to exclude *Obedience* from having any thing to do in the Business of *Justification*. And because the Sacred Writers, and even St. *Paul* himself, at other times, do speak of *Faith* as a Qualification which of *itself*, or *alone*, is of little Value in the Sight of God; this hath put them upon contriving Distinctions, and forced them to have Recourse to certain unintelligible *Internal Acts*, as Marks whereby to discriminate that *Faith* which *justifies*, from that *Faith* which does *not justify*. And thus, instead of plain and solid Instructions upon so necessary a Point, we are treated with the Froth and Jargon of the *Schools*; and the Dreams of Men have been obtruded upon us as Articles of our Faith. It is a Point, therefore, of no small Consequence, to know, whether St. *Paul* be rightly interpreted, or not; and though I cannot promise the Reader, that I have any thing new to offer upon the Subject, this Dispute having already exercised the Pens of many great Divines of our Church, and particularly of the late Learned Bishop *Bull*,

by

by whom it is very largely and very excellently handled; yet, perhaps, it may not be displeasing to those who have not the Opportunity of going to these larger Treatises, to see the Controversy, in its material Branches, reduced to a narrow Compass.

§. II. In order hereto, it will be necessary, first of all, to state the Notion of *Justification*. And concerning this, not to trouble you with the different Senses in which the Word may be found, it will be sufficient to take notice, that to *justify*, is, generally, throughout the whole New Testament, and constantly by St. *Paul* in his Discourses upon this Subject, used in a Judicial Sense; denoting, when applied to *God* as the Person *justifying* that *Act*, *Sentence*, or *Declaration*, whereby he as our Judge *determines* or *pronounces* us *just* or *righteous*; and when applied to *Man* as the Person *justified*, that *State* or *Condition* towards God *for* or *on the Account of which* he is now *adjudged* Righteous, and will be so *pronounced* at the last Day. The Places which shew this to be the true Sense of the Word, are too numerous to be here distinctly noted, and therefore I shall select only a few of them. As for Instance, *Rom.* viii. 33. *Who shall lay any thing to the Charge of God's Elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth?* In which Words, τὸ δικαιῶν, to *justify*, being manifestly opposed to τὸ ἐγκαλεῖν, to *accuse*, and also to τὸ κατακρίνειν, to *condemn*, can signify nothing else than to *acquit* or *pronounce Righteous*. So *Ch.* iii. 4. *Let God be true, and every Man a Liar, as it is written, that thou mayst be justified in thy Saying, and clear when thou art judged*; where the δικαιωθῆναι, to be *justified*, is explained by νικᾶν ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαι, the *overcoming in Judgment*. Again, *Chap.* vi. 18. *Therefore, as by the Offence of one, Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation,*

tion, even so by the Righteousness of one, the free Gift came upon all Men to Justification; where, by way of *Antithesis*, the Word *Justification* in the latter part of the Verse, answers to the Word *Condemnation* in the former. I shall name but one Place more, which is alone sufficient to decide this Matter; and that we meet with *Chap.* iii. *ver.* 20. *Therefore, by the Deeds of the Law, there shall no Flesh be justified in his Sight*; the Meaning of which Words must necessarily be this, That if God should judge Men *by* or *according* to the *Works* of the *Law*, no Man could *appear righteous* before him, or, which is the same thing, he could *adjudge* or *determine* no Man *righteous*. Now the same *Justification* which the Apostle *denies* to *Works*, the same he every where *ascribes* to *Faith*; which being *Judicial* in the one Case, in the other it must therefore be so also. This may suffice to shew the Sense of the Word *Justify*, especially considering that this Sense is not only allowed, but earnestly contended for by (*r*) those with whom I am now principally concerned. Hence therefore give me leave to observe the Mistake of those who have treated of *Justification* as if it consisted in the *Forgiveness* of *Sin*. That the *Justification* of a Man before God, *supposes* or *implies* Forgiveness of Sin, must indeed needs be true, because *all are Sinners*; But so far is it from being true, that to *justify* and to *forgive* are *one* and the *same thing*, that they are not so much as *consistent* together, with respect to one and the same *Law*; or (which comes to as much) they are not

(*r*) Nos licet non negemus non unam esse istius vocis (sc. justificationis) significationem —— —— pretendimus tamen —— semper quoties Scriptura de Justificatione nostra ex professo loquitur, & tanquam in sua sede, forensi ratione esse exponendam, *Turretin*, Loc. 16. Quæst. 1. §. 5.

con-

consistent with respect to the same Law, but under *different Qualifications*. He who *forgives* Sins committed against any Law, does, in that very Act, declare him whom he forgives, to have *sinned* against that Law. Now if a Man be declared a *Sinner* against any Law, he cannot also be *justified* or declared *righteous* according to that Law. This Point will be more fully explained afterwards; I shall now only add, that there being an inseparable Connexion between *Righteousness* and the *Reward* of *Righteousness*, *Justification* must therefore imply our *Acceptance* to *eternal Life*. Which, if it needed any other Proof, is very fully asserted by St. *Paul*, Rom. v. 8, 9, 10. *God commendeth his Love towards us, in that while we were Sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his Blood, we shall be saved from the Wrath through him. For if when we were Enemies, we were reconciled to God, by the Death of his Son, much more being reconciled, shall we be saved by his Life.* And *verse* 17. *If by one Man's Offence Death reigned —— much more they which receive —— the Gift of Righteousness, shall reign in Life.* Accordingly, in the following Verse, he calls *Justification* δικαίωσις ζωῆς. *Justification of Life*; and very frequently speaks of *Justification* and our *Acceptance* to its *Reward*, as equivalent Terms. Thus *Rom.* iv. μισθὸν λογίζεσθαι, to *impute the Reward*, in *ver.* 4. is the same with δικαιοσύνην λογίζεσθαι, *imputing Righteousness*, in *ver.* 3. And *Chap.* i. 17. ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται, to *live by Faith*, is the same thing with being *justified* by Faith. So that the full and adequate Notion of *Justification*, is this, viz. *That Act of God by which we are adjudged or declared Righteous before him, and as such accepted to the Reward of Eternal Life.*

§. III.

§. III. Having thus ſtated the Notion of *Juſtification*, I ſhall, as Preliminaries to the whole, lay down Two Propoſitions, which being duly attended to, that which is to follow, will, I conceive, be exceeding plain and obvious. The Firſt is, That *none are or can be juſtified, but thoſe who have fulfilled the Law, by which they are to be judged.* The Reaſon is plain from what has been ſaid: For thoſe who are *not* Righteous, God cannot *adjudge* or *declare* to be Righteous; For *the Judgment of God is according to Truth*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks *Rom.* ii. 2. He cannot therefore *adjudge* or *declare* thoſe to be *Righteous*, who have not fulfilled the Law by which they are judged, becauſe the having *fulfilled* that Law by which a Man is judged, is the very Notion of *Righteouſneſs*. And this is what St. *Paul* expreſsly tells us, *Verſe* 13. of the ſame Chapter, *Not the Hearers of the Law are juſt before God, but the Doers of the Law ſhall be juſtified*; i. e. No Man can be *juſtified* by any Law which he hath not *fulfilled*. And upon this very Foot it is, that he all along argues againſt the Poſſibility of our being *juſtified* by the *Law of Works*, even becauſe we are *Tranſgreſſors* againſt that Law. For thus he ſpeaks *Chap.* iii. 9. *We have before proved both* Jews *and* Gentiles *that they are all under Sin.* Now the Conſequence of this you have *Verſe* 20. *Therefore, by the Deeds of the Law there ſhall no Fleſh be juſtified.* If then we cannot be *juſtified* by the *Law* of *Works*, becauſe we have not *fulfilled* that Law, neither can we be *juſtified* by the *Law* of *Faith*, unleſs we fulfil that Law; for the Reaſon is in all Caſes the ſame. The Reader, without doubt, will readily underſtand, that when I ſpeak of our *fulfilling* the *Law*, by which we are to be judged, as neceſſary to our *Juſtification*, I mean fulfilling it *in our own Perſons*; which I remark on purpoſe to remind him of the Conceit of ſome Modern

Modern Divines, who tell us, That we are not juſtified by *our own inherent* Righteouſneſs, but by the Righteouſneſs *of Chriſt imputed to us*. They are ſenſible, that without *Righteouſneſs*, there can be no *Juſtification*; but then they ſay, that the *Righteouſneſs* is *in Chriſt* only, and that *his* Righteouſneſs *by Faith* becomes *our* Righteouſneſs. *Properly* ours, inſomuch that *we* may be truly ſaid to be *Righteous* in Virtue or on the Account of the *Righteouſneſs* of *Chriſt*. The Abſurdity of this Notion muſt appear, at the very firſt View, to any one who will duly attend it; it being inconceivable, in the Nature of the Thing, that *Chriſt*'s Righteouſneſs ſhould be *ours*, in any other than an *improper* Senſe, *viz.* Either, 1ſt. As God is pleaſed to accept us as Righteous, for the Sake of the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. Or, 2dly, As the Example of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, is a prevailing and effectual Motive with us to be Righteous alſo. Wherefore I proceed to my Second general Propoſition, which is this: That although, in order to *Juſtification*, our own *Righteouſneſs*, with reſpect to that *Law* by which we are to be *judged*, is neceſſary, yet *we muſt not aſcribe ſo much to our own Righteouſneſs, but that our being juſtified ought, nevertheleſs, to be eſteemed a Matter not of* Debt, *but of* Grace. For St. *Paul*, at the ſame time that he tells us that we are juſtified *by Faith*, tells us alſo, that we are juſtified *freely by Grace*; as you may ſee, *Rom.* iii. 24. and in ſeveral other Places. Whatever, therefore, it be which the Apoſtle means by *Faith*, *i. e.* whatever it be *in ourſelves* for the ſake, or on the account of which, God *adjudges* or *pronounces* us *Righteous*; we muſt take eſpecial care not to make it the *Cauſe* of our *Juſtification* in any Senſe, but what is conſiſtent with ſuppoſing and acknowledging, that it is through his *free Mercy* and *Goodneſs* that we are *accepted* or *juſtified*. How theſe Things are reconcileable, will

will be ſhewn in the Sequel of this Diſcourſe. I now apply my ſelf directly to the Point in hand, and becauſe the Apoſtle's Aſſertion conſiſts of Two Parts, the one the *Affirmative*, viz. That *we are juſtified by Faith:* And the other *Negative*, viz. That *we are not juſtified by Works*: I ſhall therefore proceed with a diſtinct Regard to them both; Shewing, 1. What that is to which he *aſcribes* Juſtification under the Name of *Faith*; And, 2. What that is to which he *denies* Juſtification under the Name of *Works*.

§. IV. *Firſt*, then, I am to ſhew, What that is to which the Apoſtle *aſcribes* Juſtification under the Name of *Faith*. Now, foraſmuch as I have ſhewn, that we can be juſtified no otherwiſe, than by a *Completion* of that *Law* by which we are to be *judged*; and foraſmuch as the *Law* by which we are to be *judged*, is the *Evangelical* or *Goſpel Law*, i. e. that *Law* which was *promulged* or *eſtabliſhed* by *Jeſus Chriſt*; the Anſwer to this Queſtion muſt therefore neceſſarily be this, *viz.* That the *Completion* of the *Evangelical Law*, is that to which the Apoſtle here aſcribes *Juſtification*. Allowing, I ſay, the Truth of the Premiſſes (which I hope have been ſufficiently made good) the Inference is undeniable. For it will then reſt only upon Something which the Queſtion ſuppoſes, and which no Chriſtian will deny, *viz.* That the Apoſtle has here given us a *true* Account of *Juſtification*. What then, I aſk, is the *Completion* of the *Evangelical Law*? Or, what is that by which the *Law* of the *Goſpel* is *fulfilled*? Why, plainly, Not *Faith* ALONE, *ſtrictly* or *properly* ſo called; Not a *mere Belief* in *Jeſus Chriſt*; Not a *bare Aſſent* to the Goſpel *Revelation*; nor any Act of the Underſtanding *relative* to ſuch a *Belief:* For the *Evangelical Law* not only propoſes *Truths* to be *imbraced*, but *Duties*

Duties alſo to be *performed*; It is a Law of Practice, as well as a Law of *Faith*; Yea, it is much more a Law of Practice, *than* a Law of *Faith*; the *End* of our *Believing* what God has *revealed*, being that we may *do* what he has *commanded*. What, then, can be more evident, than that the Word *Faith*, in this Place, muſt not be *underſtood* in a *ſtrict* and *proper* (*i.e.*) abſtracted Senſe, but *looſely* and *figuratively*, as denoting the *Complex* or *whole Body* of Chriſtian *Vertue*, *i. e.* as denoting both *Faith*, ſtrictly ſo called, and that *Obedience* alſo to which our *Faith* directs and ingages us?

§. V. We have brought this Point, you ſee, to a very ſhort Iſſue; but I ſhall not leave it to reſt here, intending preſently to confirm this Senſe by thoſe Interpretations which St. *Paul* himſelf has given us of his own Meaning, and the concurrent Teſtimonies of the reſt of the ſacred Writers. But there is an Objection, which, becauſe it will otherwiſe be apt to lye as a conſtant Burthen upon the Reader's Mind, it will be proper firſt of all to remove; and that is this, *viz.* That if it be neceſſary, in Order to *Juſtification*, that we *fulfil* the *Evangelical Law*, it muſt then be ſaid, that no Man can be *juſtified*, who hath not paid a *punctual* Obedience to whatever the Goſpel commands, in ſuch a Senſe as *never* to have *offended*; which (ſince *all* have *offended*) is to *exclude* all from *Juſtification*. Now, to this I anſwer; That though the *Law* of the *Goſpel*, conſider'd as the *Law* or *Rule* of *Life*, is, (as all Laws are and muſt be whilſt they are ſuch) *always* Obligatory, and, conſequently, in this reſpect, no Man can be ſaid to have *fulfilled* it, who hath not performed a *ſtrict* and *punctual* Obedience; yet it muſt be obſerved, that conſider'd as the *Law* or *Rule* by or according to which God will *judge* us; this Law

will be *fulfilled* by our *final* Obedience only, *i. e.* (for this is what I mean by *final*) by our being *at any Time* found in a *State* of *Obedience*, and, especially at the last Day. The Reason is plain, *viz.* because the Gospel Law admits of *Repentance*, *i. e.* it promiseth, that *at what Time soever* a Sinner *returns* to *Obedience*, he shall be accepted. The *Evangelical Law*, therefore, is the *Law* of *Judgment*, only with respect to our *final* Condition; and, consequently, it must, *as such*, be *fulfilled* by our *final* Obedience: For he who *repents*, *i. e.* *finally* turns to God, has done *all* that the *Law* under this View requires from him. Now this is what I maintain, *viz.* That in Order to *Justification*, it is necessary, that we fulfil not the *Law* of *Life*, but the *Law* of *Judgment*, which are very different Things; for, to speak properly, it is *one* Law by which we are to *live*, and *another* Law by which we are to be *judged*. This will be plain, if we consider, that the Diversity of *Laws* ariseth either from the Diversity of the *Matter* or *Things* enjoyned, or the Diversity of the *Circumstances* under which the *same* Things are enjoyned. Thus, for instance, If a King enjoins two of his Subjects to pay each of them an hundred Pounds, for the publick Use. Here is then one and the same *Law* to them both. But there will be different Laws if either, 1st, one should be commanded to pay *more* than another; or, 2dly, if the *same* Sum being required of both, one should be commanded to pay it in the Space of *One* Month, and the other in the Space of *Ten*. Now it is in this respect only in which I say, that the *Law* of *Life* is *one* Law, and the *Law* of *Judgment* another. For, as to the *Matter* of them, they are indeed the very *same*, the same *Duties* being enjoined by *both*; but then, as to the *Circumstances* under which the same *Duties* are enjoined, they are manifestly distinct: For, whereas the one requires

a

a *conſtant* and *perpetual* Obedience, the other requires, (as has been ſaid) only a *final* Obedience. Nor let it ſhock the Reader, to hear (what, indeed, is ſomewhat different from the common way of ſpeaking) that the *Law* according to which Men are to *live*, and the Law according to which they ſhall be *judged*, are *different* Laws. For, there is not the leaſt Difficulty in apprehending the Thing; but, only, in caſe theſe *Laws* be ſuppoſed to be *materially* different. If the *Law* only forbids Treaſon, it would be abſurd to hang a Man for *Theft* or *Perjury*: But there is no Abſurdity in ſaying, that a Man is under *one* Law *conſtantly* prohibiting *Treaſon*, and ſhall be *judged* by *another* Law, which declares a *Pardon*, in caſe the Offender returns to his Loyalty.

§. VI. The Sum is this; That he who is truly *Penitent*, has fulfilled the *Evangelical Law* of *Judgment*, though he has not fulfilled the *Evangelical Law* of *Life*; and the Obedience which I ſpeak of, as *neceſſary* to *Juſtification*, is ſuch an *Obedience* only, as is conſiſtent with, or ſuppoſes the *Benefit* of *Repentance*; that ſuch an *Obedience* as this, is, indeed, *neceſſary* to *Juſtification*, or that *Faith* excluſive of ſuch an *Obedience*, will not *juſtify*, I have already proved, and hence I have inferred, that St. *Paul*, under the Word *Faith*, muſt be ſuppoſed to *include* Obedience, when he aſcribes *Juſtification* to Faith *only*. I am now, according to my Promiſe, farther to make good this Point from thoſe Interpretations, which the Apoſtle himſelf has given us of his own Meaning, and from what we are elſewhere taught in Scripture concerning this Matter; which way of Arguing reſts upon theſe plain and unconteſted Principles, *viz.* That foraſmuch as the Sacred

Writers, in declaring to us the *Terms* of our *Acceptance* with God, were all directed by *the same Spirit*, therefore they are always upon this Point consistent with *themselves* and with *one another*; and, consequently, whatever it be to which *Justification* is ascribed in *one* Place, that must be *supposed* in *all* the rest, where the *Means* of *Justification* are spoken of, how great a Variety soever there may be found in the *Words* or *Expressions* by which these *Means* are signified or represented to us. Now, that St. *Paul* has ascribed our *Justification* to *Obedience*, as well as to *Faith*, is evident from *Gal.* v. 6. *In* Christ Jesus *neither Circumcision availeth any Thing, nor Uncircumcision, but Faith, which worketh by Love.* By *availing* here, the Apostle plainly means *availing* (*i. e.* being of any *Virtue* or *Efficacy*) with respect to *Justification*; for he was now arguing against the *Jews*, who expected to be *justified* by the *Law* of *Moses.* These Words, then do very clearly set forth to us, that we are not *justified* by Faith *alone*, but by Faith *in Conjunction* with its *proper Effects.* For, by *Love* here, we are to understand the *Love* of God; and to say that *Faith* then only *availeth*, when it *worketh by Love*, is exactly the same thing as to say, that what will avail, or stand us in any stead, is *Faith* and *those Works of Love*, i. e. of *Obedience*, to which our *Faith* doth lead and direct us I say, of *Obedience*; for *this is the Love of God, that we keep his Commandments.* This Sense will be farther evident from what follows, *Chap.* vi. *Verse* 15. *In* Christ Jesus *neither Circumcision availeth any Thing, nor Uncircumcision, but a* NEW CREATURE. In these Words, the Apostle says the same Thing of *Circumcision*, that he had said before, *viz.* that it *availeth* not; And what he denies of *Circumcision*, he here affirms of the *New Creature*, as he

he *did of* that *Faith which worketh by Love* in the other Place; which ſhews, that the *Faith which worketh by Love*, and the *New Creature*, are Phraſes importing one and the ſame Thing. Now foraſmuch as the *New Creature* implies both *Faith* and *Obedience*, as has been already proved, the Conſequence is undeniable, that by the *Faith which worketh by Love*, he means *Faith* and *Obedience*. Once more, The Apoſtle has aſcribed *Juſtification* to *Obedience* in expreſs Terms, as you may ſee, 1. *Cor.* vii. 19. *Circumciſion is nothing, and Uncircumciſion is nothing, but* KEEPING THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD. Theſe Words are exactly parallel to thoſe which I have already mentioned, and there is no poſſible Way of making St. *Paul* ſpeak conſiſtently with himſelf, than by ſaying, that as the *Obedience* he here mentions, neceſſarily ſuppoſes or includes *Faith*, ſo that *Faith*, when he ſpeaks of it as the *only* Means of our *Juſtification*, does alſo ſuppoſe or include *Obedience*. I might farther have inſiſted upon that Saying of the ſame Apoſtle, *Rom.* vi. 16. *Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourſelves Servants to obey, his Servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of Sin unto Death, or of Obedience? εἰς δικαιοσύνην, unto* (r) Juſtification; where, as *Death* is aſcribed to *Sin*, ſo *Juſtification* is alſo aſcribed to *Obedience*. I might likewiſe have taken Notice, that at *Rom.* x. 16. he explains the Word πιστεύειν, to *believe*, by ὑπακούειν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, *obeying the Goſpel*; and that what he ſometimes calls ſimply πίστις, *Faith*, he at other Times calls, ὑπακοὴ

(r) *Our Tranſlation renders it*, Of Obedience unto Righteouſneſs. *But St.* Paul *frequently uſes* δικαιοσύνη *for* δικαίωσις; *and ſo it is uſed here, for it is oppoſed to* θάνατος, Bull. Harm. Apoſt. Diſſert. 2. Chap. iv. §. 9.

πίστεως, *the Obedience of Faith*, i. e. the Obedience which *arises* or *proceeds* from Faith, as you may see *Rom.* i. 5, 16, 26. But that which I have already offered, is, I think, abundantly sufficient for my Purpose; I shall therefore only add, That when I say, that St. *Paul* uses the Word *Faith*, as including *Obedience*, I mean no more, than that it is so used in all those Places where he ascribes *Justification* to Faith *only*. At other Times, I am well aware, that he speaks in a more confined Sense; having already shewn you one Place where *Faith* is plainly *distinguished* from its Effects; and you may observe the same Thing, 1. *Cor.* xiii. where he states the Comparison in Point of Excellency, between *Faith*, *Hope* and *Charity*. But, then, you must also observe at the same Time, as a Confirmation of what has been said, that whenever the Apostle does thus distinguish *Faith* from its *Effects*, he is so far from telling us, that we are *justified* by Faith *only*, that he speaks of it comparatively as a *mean* and *low* Qualification, which is particularly remarkable in the Place just now referr'd to: *If*, says he, *I have all Faith, so that I could remove Mountains, and have not Charity, I am nothing*. If I have *all Faith*, i. e. If I have (*s*) *all kinds* of *Faith*, even *that Sort* of *Faith* by which I should be enabled to work the greatest of *Miracles*, all this would avail me nothing; it would not render me acceptable in the Sight of God; nor, consequently, *justify* me, except I had also *Charity*.

(*s*) *For this is the meaning of* πᾶσα πίστις. *So* πᾶσα γνῶσις, *is* all Kinds of Knowledge; πᾶσα θλῖψις, every Sort *or* every kind of Tribulation. 2. *Cor.* i. 4. Id. Ibid. §. 6.

§. VII.

§. VII. Thus plainly has St. *Paul* asserted the *Co-efficiency* of *Obedience* in the Work of *Justification*; as if it had been on purpose to advertise us, that whatever high and lofty Encomiums he has elsewhere bestowed upon Faith, they must be understood of *Faith* in conjunction with *Obedience*. Let us now hear what the Holy Scriptures have in other Places taught us concerning this Matter; and who can desire a stronger Proof than those Words of our blessed Lord, recorded by St. *Matt.* Ch. xii. Ver. 37. *For by thy Words thou shalt be justified, and by thy Words thou shalt be condemned?* Or than those *Luke* xviii. 14. where our Saviour stating the Comparison between the *Pharisee* and the *Publican*, who *went up to the Temple to pray*, and observing the *Humility* and *Contrition* of the one, and the *Pride* and *Self-sufficiency* of the other, says, *I tell you, that this Man went home to his House justified, rather than the other?* Justified? How? Why, certainly, by his *good Behaviour*, or not at all: For, this was what our Saviour was speaking about. And does not this very plainly imply, that our *Obedience* is that whereby we must be *justified*? But the Words of St. *James* are of all others most full to the Purpose, *Chap.* ii. *Verse* 24. where having professedly treated upon the Subject, he lays down this Conclusion, (in Words, indeed, differing from, but in Sense, as I hope to shew, agreeing with, that of St. *Paul*) *Ye see then, how that by Works a Man is justified, and not by Faith only.* What the Apostle means by *Faith*, it is by no means hard to understand, nor, if it were, is it at all material to inquire. For the main Stress of the Argument lies upon this, that *Justification* is here, in Part, expressly ascribed to *Works*, i. e. to *Obedience*. But of what *Justification* does the Apostle speak? Why, say some, not of our Justification *before God*, but of our Justification *before Man*; i. e. of

the *Declaration* of our *Faith* before Man, which being an *internal*, and, conſequently, an *inviſible* Act, can, therefore, be known by others no otherwiſe than by a ſuitable *Behaviour*: This vain Conceit they endeavour to ſupport principally by theſe two Reaſons, *viz.* 1ſt, From the Words of the Apoſtle, *verſe* 18. *Shew me thy Faith without thy Works, and I will ſhew thee my Faith by my Works.* And, 2dly, From hence, that *Abraham* is ſaid to have been *juſtified* by the *Sacrifice* of his *Son*, whereas, ſay they, in the *Sight of God* he was juſtified *long before*. But, without tarrying to give an Anſwer to ſuch Arguments as theſe, which every one, who has Senſe, muſt ſee, are too frivolous to deſerve an Anſwer, I ſhall lay down ſome plain Reaſons to ſhew, that this Interpretation cannot be admitted of; and they are theſe that follow, *viz.* 1ſt, The Apoſtle does manifeſtly *in part* aſcribe our *Juſtification* to *Faith*; for he ſaith, that *a Man is juſtified by Works, and not by Faith* ONLY; which implies, that *Faith*, tho' it be not indeed the *ſole*, is yet the *partial* Cauſe of *our Juſtification*. But a Man's *Faith*, is *declared* or *made known* by *Works only*, becauſe, as I ſaid juſt now, it is an *internal Act*; and, conſequently, in this Senſe *Faith* cannot be ſo much as *in part* the *Cauſe* of our *Juſtification*. 2d, To ſuppoſe, that by *Juſtification* the Apoſtle means the *Declaration* of our *Faith*, is to make him talk palpable Nonſenſe. For, the *Declaration* of *Faith* being ſubſtituted in the Room of *Juſtification*, the Sentence muſt run thus; *Ye ſee then, that a Man's Faith, is declared by Works, and not by Faith only*, than which, nothing can be more abſurd. 3d, That when the Apoſtle ſays of *Abraham*, that he was *juſtified* by *Works*, his Meaning is, that he was juſtified *before God*, is evident from *verſe* 23. For by this (*i. e.* the *Obedience* of *Abraham* per-

fecting

ſetting his Faith) *the Scripture*, ſays he, *was fulfilled, which ſaith*, Abraham *believed in God, and it was imputed unto him for Righteouſneſs, and he was called the Friend of God.* Now, in the ſame Senſe in which he declares, that *Abraham* was *juſtified* by *Works*, in the ſame Senſe he declares, that *we* are *juſtified* by *Works* alſo. 4. All this will be ſtill more evident from *verſe* 14. where the Apoſtle entring upon this Diſcourſe, ſays, that *Faith*, i. e. Faith *alone*, or *without Works, cannot ſave us.* This was the Point he undertook to prove, and therefore, to this muſt his *Concluſion* relate, *viz.* That *a Man is juſtified by Works, and not by Faith only.*

§. VIII. I had not taken any notice of this Objection (which appears, I think, at firſt ſight, to have no weight in it) but that I was unwilling to leave ſo material a Paſſage as this, liable to the leaſt Doubt or Scruple. But, in truth, to mention Particulars under this Head, is an endleſs Work, for to this Purpoſe belong all thoſe Places of Scripture (which, that I may juſt note it by the way, do no where more frequently occur, than in the Writings of St. *Paul*) where *Obedience* is inſiſted upon, as *neceſſary* to qualify us for *Eternal Salvation.* Theſe Places, I ſay, do afford an inconteſtable Evidence of the Truth of what I am now advancing, and it would make a Man even ſick, to ſee by what pitiful Subterfuges thoſe who place *Juſtification* in *Faith*, excluſive of *Obedience*, endeavour to evade it. In general, they tell us, that *(t)* though we cannot be *ſaved without*

(*t*) Aliud eſt opera--*requiri* in perſona quæ juſtificatur, quod concedimus; aliud in actu ipſo ſeu *cauſalitate* juſtificationis, quod negamus. Nec ſi *requirantur* opera ut *concomitantia* fidem ideo ſtatuuntur eſſe *cauſa* juſtificationis *cum fide. Turretin. Loc.* 16. *Quæſt.* 8. § 13.

Obe-

Obedience, it may, nevertheleſs, be true, that we are not *juſtified by*, or *in Virtue of* Obedience. That it is one Thing to ſay, that *Good Works* are *required* as the *Concomitants* of *Faith*, and another Thing to ſay, that they are the *Cauſe* of Juſtification *together with* Faith. But the Reaſon of this ſubtle Diſtinction is to me utterly incomprehenſible. For, 1. Whatever is the *Cauſe* of *Salvation*, is alſo the *Cauſe* of *Juſtification*; for theſe Two Things are inſeparable; and the *immediate Ground* or *Reaſon* upon which we are *ſaved*, is that we are *juſtified*, as has been ſhewn. Give me leave then to argue in this manner: I am therefore *ſaved* becauſe I am *juſtified*; I am therefore *ſaved* becauſe I *believe* in Chriſt, and *keep his Commandments*. Therefore to *believe* in Chriſt, and *keep his Commandments*, is that by which I am *juſtified*. The *firſt* Propoſition in this Argument is not to be diſputed; and ſuppoſing the Truth of the *Second*, the *Concluſion* will be undeniable, ſo far, I mean, as to prove, that both *Faith* and *Obedience*, are, *in ſome Senſe*, jointly the *Cauſe* of our *Juſtification*, i. e. in the *ſame* Senſe in which they are jointly the *Cauſe* of our *Salvation*. Now then, 2. The Point is this, *viz.* Whether *Obedience* be not the *Cauſe* of our *Salvation*, in the *ſame Senſe* in which *Faith* is the *Cauſe* of our *Salvation*? And that it *is*, is manifeſt: For *Faith* can be ſaid to be the *Cauſe* of our *Salvation*, in no other Senſe, than as it is a *Condition*, upon the Performance of which, *Salvation* is promiſed, and in this Senſe 'tis notorious, that *Obedience* is the *Cauſe* of *Salvation*, as well as *Faith*. Either then it is true, that *Obedience*, together with *Faith*, is the *Cauſe* of our *Salvation*, or elſe it is not true, that even *Faith* is the *Cauſe* of our *Salvation*. But the Truth is, that they are *both* together the *Cauſe* of our *Salvation*, as they do both together conſtitute

that

that to which, in Virtue of the *Promiſe* of God, *Salvation* is *inſeparably* annexed. As to what is here commonly pretended, *viz.* That *(u) Good Works* are required only as a *Sign* or *Declaration* of *Faith*, it is neither Senſe, nor, if it were, is it any thing to the Purpoſe. For, *Obedience* has a Tendency to *ſignify* or *declare* our *Faith* upon no other Account, than becauſe our Faith *leads us to Obedience*, i. e. ſhews us ſomething, which, in Virtue of the Divine Authority, we are bound to perform. The *Neceſſity of Obedience*, therefore, muſt be ſuppoſed *antecedently* to its being a *Sign* of *Faith*; and how then is it poſſible, that the *ſignifying* or *declaring* our *Faith*, ſhould be the *Reaſon* why it is required? Furthermore, St. *James* tells us, that *Obedience* is the *Perfection* of *Faith*; for, *by Works*, ſays he, *is Faith made perfect.* If then *Obedience* be the *Perfection* of *Faith*, it cannot be required *merely* as a *Sign* of *Faith*, for the *Sign* has no relation to the *Perfection* of the Thing *ſignified.* ——But I am aſhamed to tarry any longer upon ſuch manifeſt Trifles. Be it ſo, that *Obedience* is required only as a *Sign* or *Declaration* of *Faith*; yet ſtill you grant, that it is required; and I ſay, that God hath made it a *Condition* of our *Salvation*, that we give, if you will ſo call it, this *Sign* or *Declaration* of our *Faith.* Shew me then, I ſay, if you can, how Faith *itſelf* is the *Cauſe* of our *Salvation*, any otherwiſe than under the Notion of a *Condition*, or confeſs your own Abſurdity in excluding *Obedience* (which is alſo a *Condition*) from being, together with *Faith*, the Cauſe of our Juſtification.

(u) *Opera*——requiruntur tanquam *effecta* & *ſigna* fidei quibus ejus veritas declaritur. Nam ut *fides* juſtificat *hominem*; ita *opera* juſtificant *fidem. Id. Ib.* §. 3.

§. IX.

§. IX. Either my Reaſon very much deceives me, or this Argument is unanſwerable. But anſwered it muſt be; and how do they do it? Why, by ſuch Cobweb Diſtinctions as you have already ſeen, which, if they had ſo much Senſe in them as to bear Examination, I might, perhaps, have taken notice of. But inſtead of purſuing theſe Divines through their own endleſs Labyrinths, it will be more to the Purpoſe, ſomewhat more diſtinctly to explain what I mean by a *Condition* of *Salvation*, by which it will ſtill be more evident, that *Faith* and *Obedience* have the *ſame Relation* to *Eternal Life*; and, conſequently, that *one* is as truly the *Cauſe* of our *Juſtification*, as the *other*. A *Condition* of *Salvation*, then, as I ſaid juſt now, is that upon the *Performance* of which God hath promiſed *Salvation*; and thus far the Thing is not capable of being made clearer. What I have now to add, is this, That foraſmuch as it is the Nature of *all* Promiſes, to convey a certain Right to the Perſon to whom the *Promiſe* is made, every one therefore muſt be underſtood to have a *Right* to *Eternal Life*, who has performed the Conditions, upon the Performance of which *Eternal Life* is *promiſed*; and when God, in conſequence of his *Promiſe*, beſtows *Eternal Life*, the *Performance* of theſe *Conditions* muſt be conſidered as the immediate *Reaſon* or *Motive* with God, why he beſtows it. The *Performance*, therefore, of the *Conditions* upon which *Eternal Life* is promiſed, is in this Senſe the *Cauſe* of our *Salvation*, viz. As it is that in ourſelves, *for the ſake* or *on the account* of which, God *beſtows* Salvation; and in this ſenſe, I ſay, or under this Notion, it is, that *Faith* ſaves us. For he who *requires* me to *believe*, and *promiſes*, withal, that *if I do* believe, I ſhall be *ſaved* (which is manifeſtly the Caſe) does thereby very plainly declare, that he

he will *ſave* me, *for the ſake* or *on the Account* of my *Faith*. But then, if *Faith* be not the *only* Thing required; if the ſame God who commands me to *believe*, commands me alſo to *obey*, and *promiſes* Eternal Life as the *Reward* of my *Obedience*, (which is likewiſe the Caſe) it is then plain, that both *Faith* and *Obedience* muſt be conſidered, as *co-ordinate* Means to one and the ſame End, *i. e.* that they do *both* of them *together* conſtitute *that* for *the ſake* of, or *on the Account* of which, God will *beſtow* upon us the Privilege of *Eternal Life*.

§. X. This Point, which almoſt every Page of the Goſpel confirms, being duly attended to, it will be eaſy enough to ſee to the Bottom of all that Sophiſtry and Chicane, by which this Subject has been ſo much perplexed; and the Conſequence which has before been laid down, will remain firm and undeniable, *viz.* That *Faith* and *Obedience* having the *ſame Relation* to *Eternal Life*, muſt therefore have the *ſame Relation* to *Juſtification*, which is the immediate *Reaſon* or *Motive* with God, why he *beſtows* Eternal Life. And this will be further confirmed, by conſidering, in what ſort God will proceed with us at the Day of Judgment: For the laſt Judgment will be nothing elſe than a Publick and Solemn *Declaration* of Chriſt our *Judge*, who are *Righteous*, and who are not *Righteous*; and, in Conſequence of this *Declaration*, an *Aſſignment* of them to a State of *Happineſs*, or a State of *Miſery*. What then, I aſk, is that *Rule* or *Meaſure* according to which this *Declaration* ſhall be made? I hope you will not ſay, our *Faith* only: For how often do the Scriptures tell us, that God will *judge every Man according to his Works?* And how plain is it, that the very *Reaſon* of our being *called to appear before the Judgment Seat of Chriſt*, is, *that every Man may receive the Things done*

done in his Body, according to that he hath done, whether it be Good or Bad? If then we are to be *judged* according to our *Works*, as well as according to our *Faith*, muſt not then our *Works*, as well as our *Faith*, be the *Ground* or *Reaſon*, upon which we ſhall be *juſtified* or *declared righteous?* Why, look at *Matt.* xxv. 34. and you will ſee; *Then ſhall the King ſay unto them on his Right-hand, Come, ye Bleſſed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you.* The Reaſon follows in the next Words; *For I was an hungred, and ye gave me Meat: I was thirſty, and ye gave me Drink*, &c. Theſe are the Premiſſes; and I leave any Man, who has Senſe, to draw the Concluſion.

§. XI. Upon the whole, then, I think, it plainly appears, that whether you interpret St. *Paul* by *himſelf*, or by what we learn from the *reſt* of the *ſacred Writers*, he muſt be ſuppoſed, under the Word *Faith*, to include *Obedience*, in all thoſe Places where he aſcribes *Juſtification* to Faith *only*. A Thing which there would need very little arguing about, if thoſe who deny it, would duly attend to what, at the ſame Time, is very freely acknowledged by them. For, do they not tell us, that (*w*) *Faith alone*, i. e. *ſeparated from all other Chriſtian Virtues, will not juſtify, becauſe in this Caſe it is not a True Faith?* Where then I pray is the Difference? Why, make the moſt of it you can, and it will amount to no more than a *quâ* or a

(*w*) Non quæritur an fides *ſolitaria*, i. e. ſeparata à cæteris virtutibus *juſtificet*, quod fieri non poſſe facile concedimus, cum ne quidem ſit *vera* & *viva* fides; ſed an *ſola concurrat* ad *actum* juſtificationis — Non an fides *quæ* juſtificat ſit *operoſa* — Sed an *quâ* juſtificat — ſub tali σχέσει ſpectanda ſit. — *Sola fides* non juſtificat, ſed *fides* juſtificat *ſola*, *Id. Ibid.* §. 6.

quate-

quatenus, i. e. it will come to no more than this, *viz.* That, though that *Faith* which *justifies*, must be *attended* with all other Virtues, yet it does not justify, *considered as attended* with those Virtues. Vain and Foolish Contention! Was it, think you, the Business of an Apostle of Jesus Christ, and of that Apostle too who every where expresses so great a *Contempt* of *Human Wisdom* and *Philosophy*, to teach such *Metaphysicks* as this! For my own part, I have other (and I think much more worthy) Notions of the first Preachers of the Gospel. I consider them as plain Men speaking to plain Men; and, therefore, when I hear them telling me in so many Words, that *Faith without Works, is dead being alone*, I presently conclude, that I must be justified by my *Works*, as well as by my *Faith*, because I can think of no other Reason by which a plain Man can be made to understand, why a *true*, *lively*, or *justifying* Faith, must be attended with *Good Works*, than this, that we must be *justified* by the *one*, as well as by the *other*. As to those Distinctions which Men of *subtle* Heads may *fancy* they espy, I should envy no Man the Pleasure of them, who would be contented to be wise and happy by himself. But 'tis intolerable to have such *Conceits* obtruded upon us, as if they were of the very *(x) Essence* of Christianity;

(x) *It may, perhaps, be not unworthy the Reader's Observation, to see how magnificently Mr.* Turretin *has set forth the* Necessity *of believing* (in Virtue of the foregoing *Distinction*) *that* Good Works *are not so much as* in part *the Cause of our* Justification. *His Words are these.* — Facile colligitur meram hic non esse Logomachiam, ut nonnulli perperam sibi fingunt: sed controversiam MAXIME REALEM & quidem TANTI MOMENTI ut in ea de PRÆCIPUO salutis nostræ agatur FUNDAMENTO quo subruto vel labefactato OMNEM FIDUCIAM & CONSOLATIONEM nostram, & in vita & in morte PERIRE necesse est, *Loc.* 16. *Quæst.* 2. §. 6.

espe-

especially considering how much danger there is, that those who think in the Common Road, and have not a *Taste* adapted to *Delicacies* of this sort, should (which, alas! has too frequently been the Case) when they are told, that they are not justified *by* good Works, lay hold of this ready and natural Inference, that therefore they may be justified and saved *without* them, and hereupon throw off all Manner of Care and Endeavour after Righteousness.

§. XII. But to proceed. If you would know the Reason why St. *Paul* has used the Word *Faith*, to express the Performance of *all* the *Conditions* of the *Evangelical Covenant*, it would be no hard matter to assign several not improbable ones; but the Chief I take to be this, *viz.* That *Faith* is the *Source* and *Principle* of *Evangelical Righteousness*; a Qualification *without* which, no Christian Grace can possibly subsist, and which being once *supposed*, all other Virtues will naturally follow. *Without Faith it is impossible to please God*, as the Apostle speaks *Heb.* xi. 6. For *Faith* is, as it were, the *Door* which *opens* to us the *Way* how to serve God acceptably. And supposing that a Man wisely considers, and lays to Heart what it is that he believes, it may as truly be said on the other side, that *with* Faith it is impossible *not* to please God; for he who believes, that *Jesus* came from God, receives his *Doctrines* as the *Law* of *Life*, and is under a firm Persuasion, that *Eternal Life* will be the *Reward* of his *Obedience*, and *Eternal Death* the *Punishment* of his *Disobedience*; Such a one, I say, cannot, unless he be very careless and inconsiderate, but earnestly set himself to the Performance of whatever he knows will render him acceptable to God, and as industriously avoid every Thing by which he knows He will be displeased. There being then so close a Connexion be-

between *Faith* and *Obedience*, the one is not unfitly described by the other; and it may not be improper to observe, that for the very same Reason, the Word *Knowledge* is in Scripture made use of, to denote the *whole* of that *Piety* which we owe to God, and which is necessary to our everlasting Salvation; as you may see *John* xvii. 13. and in many other Places. So that there is in both these Cases a *Metonymy* of the *Antecedent* for the *Consequent*, or rather of the *Cause* for the *Effect*, by which something is affirmed of the *former*, only which, in Strictness of Propriety in Speech, belongs to *both* taken together. This is a way of speaking common in all Authors, and in our ordinary Discourses one with another. For thus we say of any Person, That his *Life* might probably have been prolonged, if he had *consulted* some able and experienced *Physician*; or his *Estate* saved, if he had advised with some learned and skilful *Lawyer*; not that the bare *Advice* in either Case would have done the Work, but because it is *supposed*, that he who goes to a *Physician* for the Recovery of his *Health*, or to a *Lawyer* for the saving of his *Estate*, will, in those Cases, *pursue* such *Methods* as the Person with whom he advises, shall judge to be expedient. And thus it is, that *Faith* is said to *justify* us; not as if Faith *alone* were sufficient, but because it is *supposed*, that he who *believes* in Jesus Christ, will be led by his Faith to *keep his Commandments*.

§. XIII. I take this to be a clear Account of the Use of the Phrase. I have now but one Objection to answer before I dismiss this Point; and that is this, *viz.* That if it be true, that we are justified by *Faith* and *Obedience*, i. e. by a *Completion* of the *Evangelical Law*; it must then be said, that *Justification* is a matter of *Debt*, and not of *Grace*,

as the Apoſtle affirms; becauſe it is a *Debt* due to thoſe who *are Righteous*, to be *adjudged* or *declared* Righteous. Now to this I reply, that tho' becauſe God is *juſt* and *true*, he cannot but *adjudge* or *declare* Men *to be* what they *really are*, yet *Juſtification* will ſtill be a Matter of *Grace*, and not of *Debt*; and that becauſe, 1. It is intirely thro' the *Mercy* and *Goodneſs* of God in *Jeſus Chriſt*, that he hath appointed that *Law* of *Judgment*, without which we could never have pleaded *Righteouſneſs* before him. Were God to judge us by the Law of Unſinning Obedience (which he might if he had ſo pleaſed) 'tis certain, that *no Fleſh* could be *juſtified in his ſight*, becauſe it is certain, that there are *none* by whom that *Law* hath not been *violated*. But foraſmuch as he will not judge us by that *Law*, but, as has been ſaid, by *another* Law, to wit, the *Law* of *Repentance*, that we are *juſtified* muſt needs be a Matter of *Grace*; for the Law *itſelf* being founded in *Grace*, the *Righteouſneſs* pleaded by or according to that *Law*, muſt be founded in *Grace*; and if it be *through Grace* that we are *righteous*, it muſt alſo be *through Grace* that we are *juſtified* or *declared righteous*. This will be farther evident, if it be conſidered, 2. That *Juſtification*, as has been ſhewn, conſiſts not *merely* in our being *adjudged* or *declared righteous* before God, but implies alſo our being *accepted* to the *Reward* of *Eternal Life*; which *Reward* being infinitely more than what we could *claim*, even in virtue of the *ſtricteſt* and moſt *punctual* Obedience, *Juſtification* therefore, muſt upon this Account, be a Matter of *Grace*, although it were true, that our *Righteouſneſs* is *not* a Matter of *Grace*. But indeed this Conſideration does more effectually ſhew, that our Righteouſneſs *is* a Matter of *Grace*; for the *Reward* of *Eternal Life* is the great *Motive* or *Inducement* which leads us to

Obe-

Obedience; and, surely, it is enough to cut off all Pretence of *boasting*, if not only we have done *very little*, in comparison to what God might have required, but we have been invited to do even *that little* by so rich and so gracious a *Promise*. After all, it must be acknowledged, that *Justification* is in *this Sense* a Matter of *Debt*, as it becomes (if I may so speak) our *Due* in Consequence of our having performed those *Conditions*, upon which God has *declared* that he will *accept* us. But as this Objection is not to be avoided upon any Hypothesis (since whatever it be which *justifies* us, it can *justify* no otherwise than in virtue of the *Divine Promise*) it can therefore be of no Weight against this. The Truth is, that though the Scripture tells us, we are justified *freely by God's Grace*, yet it no where makes *Justification* to be an *absolute* Act of *Grace*, so as that *none* of the Praise of it belongs to us; for this is utterly inconsistent with its being made to depend upon any *Condition*, and, consequently, destroys the very *Notion* of *Justification*, which, in the very Nature of it, must *suppose* a *Condition*, i. e. the *fulfilling* of *that Law* with respect to which we are said to be *justified*.

§. XIV. But there is the less need to insist upon these Things now, seeing that to this Point may so easily be applied, what has been spoken at large upon *(s)* another Occasion. Wherefore having (as I hope) cleared the *first* Branch of the Apostle's Assertion, by shewing you, what it is to which he *ascribes* Justification under the Name of *Faith*, I proceed to inquire, in the next Place, what it is to which he *denies* Justification, under the Name of *Works*, or (for thus he here, and else-

(s) Operations of the Spirit, *Chap.* 13.

where, very frequently expreſſes the Thing) *Deeds* or *Works of the Law.* This Inquiry is ſo much the more neceſſary, becauſe here indeed lies the greateſt Difficulty; and if it be true what has too often been ſuppoſed, that by *Works* the Apoſtle means *Works* of *Evangelical Righteouſneſs*, it muſt either be concluded, that ſome great Miſtake has been committed in ſtating the foregoing Point, or elſe, that he has flatly contradicted himſelf. There are Two Things then which ought to be diſtinctly conſidered, *viz.* 1. What that *Law* is whoſe *Works* or *Deeds* the Apoſtle excludes from Juſtification? And, 2. In *what Senſe* the *Works* or *Deeds* of the Law are excluded from Juſtification? Which Queſtions will be beſt reſolved, by taking a View of the whole Diſpute, as it lies in St. *Paul* himſelf, carefully obſerving the *Perſons* concerning whom he ſpeaks, and the Reaſons upon which his Aſſertion is founded. To this Purpoſe a good deal has been already ſaid, in a *(t)* former Treatiſe. But this being not ſo full as the preſent Occaſion ſeems to require, and becauſe this Work may poſſibly fall into the Hands of ſome who have not the other by them; I here propoſe to give you an intire Paraphraſe of the firſt Four Chapters of this Epiſtle, which are the Ground-work of all that the Apoſtle has elſewhere advanced upon this Subject. And from hence I doubt not but I ſhall be able to make ſuch Obſervations, as will ſhew, that the *former* part of the Aſſertion, as above explained, is ſo far from being *overthrown*, that it is *confirmed* and *eſtabliſhed* by the *latter*. If the Reader then will be pleaſed to lay the Original before him, and go along with me from *Chap.* i. *Verſe* 16. which is the Place

(t) Appeal to the Word of God, *&c.* Chap. iv. p. 49.

where

where St. *Paul* first enters upon the Dispute, he will, I conceive, find him arguing to this Purpose, *viz.*

§. XV. " I am not ashamed of the Gospel of " Christ; For, it is the Method which God hath " appointed for the Salvation of Men. It is the " Way of Salvation, *first* indeed to the *Jews* [who, " by God's own Appointment, were vouchsafed " the Privilege of being *first called* to it, *Acts* iii. " 26. and *Chap.* xiii. 46.] But it is the Way of " Salvation to *every one* that *believeth*, whether " he be *Jew* or *Gentile*; forasmuch as the Purpose " of God to justify *all* without Distinction, *by* " their Faith *(u)* who shall *embrace* the Faith, " is herein very plainly revealed, in conformity " to what was heretofore spoken by the Prophet, " *The Just shall live by Faith*, Vers. 16, 17. [And " as the Purpose of God, to justify those who be- " lieve, is revealed in the Gospel, so also] is his " Wrath revealed against all Ungodliness and Un- " righteousness of Men; *(w)* through whose wil- ful

---

(u) That εἰς πίστιν, might here be put for εἰς τὸς πιστεύοντας, I before propounded, as my conjecture (*Appeal* p. 50.) of which I can now no longer doubt. That *Substantives* are frequently used instead of *Adjectives*, or *Participles*, every one knows. Thus ἡ ἐκλογὴ for οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ, Rom. xi. 7. περιτομὴ for περιτετμημένοι, *Rom.* iii. 30. and the like. But that which confirms me in this Sense, is this, that in *Verse* 22. of the Chapter last quoted, the Apostle speaks expressly in this manner, calling the *Righteousness* or *Justification of God*, δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεῦ διὰ πίστεως εἰς πάντας τὸς πιστεύοντας. The Expression is very emphatical, and the Design of it is to shew, not only that Justification *belongs* to those who *believe*, but that their *believing* is *the Reason*, and the *only* Reason, why they are *justified*.

(w) The Greek is τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων, which, as I have also observed, may be rendered either (according,

" ful Corruption and Depravity it hath happened, " that thoſe Evidences which God from Time to " Time hath given of himſelf, and his True Religi- " on, have been obſtructed and made ineffectual, " *verſe* 18. [That this is the Caſe with reſpect " to the *Gentiles* is undeniable;] For God hath " ſufficiently manifeſted himſelf to them; the " Works of the Creation being a Viſible Demon- " ſtration of his Inviſible and Eternal Power and " Godhead. In this, therefore, they are inex-

---

cording to our Tranſlation) *of thoſe who hold the Truth in Unrighteouſneſs*, i. e. who are unrighteous under the *Senſe* or *Knowledge* of the Truth; or *of thoſe who* hinder, *or* ſuppreſs *the Truth through Unrighteouſneſs*, for the Word κατέχειν bears both Senſes, as you may ſee, 2 *Theſſ.* ii. 6, 7. 1 *Cor.* xi. 2. Now that which determined me to the latter Senſe, in this Place, is this, *viz.* That otherwiſe the Words will have no Connexion with what follows, nor can they be applied to the *Heathens*; (who yet, it is certain, were the Perſons, if not *principally*, at leaſt *partly*, aimed at;) For the *Heathens* were *unrighteous*, not under the *Knowledge* of the Truth, but, under a *groſs Ignorance* of the Truth; and this is what the Apoſtle directly charges them with *Verſe* 21. where he ſays, That *their Hearts were darkned*; and that *profeſſing themſelves wiſe, they became fools.* The Caſe, therefore, was this; That the Heathens had that *Evidence*, which, if they had duly attended to it, *would have* led them to the *Knowledge* of *God*; on which account St. *Paul* (by an Idiom of Speech, familiar with the ſacred Writers) ſays, that they *knew God.* For, *in fact*, they had *not* the *Knowledge* of *God*, (as he expreſly obſerves, *Verſe* 28.) but fell into the moſt Wicked and Superſtitious Idolatry (for which he ſeverely reproves them, *Verſ.* 22, 23.) Now all this happening not through a true of the Means of Knowledge, but through an Abuſe of thoſe Means, they are therefore ſaid, *through* their *Unrighteouſneſs*, κατέχειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, to *obſtruct* or *hinder* the Truth, *i. e.* thoſe *Evidences* which God had given of *himſelf*, and his *true Religion.* This was in ſome ſort true of the *Jews*, who, as our Saviour told them, had *ſet aſide the Commandments of God through their Traditions.* But it was not remarkably true of them, after the Promulgation of the Goſpel, which the *Hardneſs* of their *Hearts* would not ſuffer them to accept of. Accordingly, the Apoſtle continues the ſame Charge againſt *them*, as you will find in the next Chapter.

cuſable,

" cuſable, that having ſuch Evidences of God, yet " they glorifyed him not as God, neither were " thankful; but became wicked in their Imagi- " nations: that amidſt all this Light, they were " yet in Darkneſs; and became Fools, under the " higheſt Pretenſions to Wiſdom; changing the " Glory of the incorruptible God, into an Image " made like to corruptible Man, and to Birds, " and fourfooted Beaſts, and creeping Things, " *Ver.* 19—23. Wherefore God alſo gave them " up to Uncleanneſs, thro' the Luſts of their own " Hearts, to diſhonour their own Bodies between " themſelves; who had changed the Truth of " God into a Lye; and worſhipped and ſerved the " Creature, to the Diſhonour of the Creator, who " is bleſſed for ever, *&c.*" What follows in this Chapter, is only a farther Account of thoſe Abominations which God ſuffered the Gentile World to fall into, as a Puniſhment for their Idolatry; which carrying no difficulty with it, needs not therefore to be explained. Now it is to be obſerved, that this Accuſation, ſeems to have been laid againſt the *Gentiles*, chiefly with a Deſign to introduce, with leſs Offence, a like Charge againſt the *Jews*, who, 'tis certain, were the Perſons againſt whom the Deſign of this Epiſtle was *principally* levelled. To theſe, therefore, he applies himſelf, *Chap.* ii. " Therefore thou art inexcuſable, O " Man, whoſoever thou art that judgeſt; for where- " in thou judgeſt another, thou condemneſt thy ſelf; " ſeeing thou that judgeſt, doſt the ſame Things, " *Verſe.* 1. As for ourſelves we are aſſured, " that the Judgment of God is according to " the Rules of Truth and Equity, and conſe- " quently, lies equally againſt all, who commit " ſuch Things [whether they be *Jews*, or whe- " ther they be *Gentiles*;] And art *thou*, who art " ſo forward to judge others, ſo vain as to

" believe, that whilſt thou art guilty of the ſame
" Things thyſelf, thou ſhalt eſcape the Judgment
" of God? Or, deſpiſeſt thou the Riches of
" his Goodneſs, and Forbearance, and Long-
" ſuffering, and (not conſidering that the Good-
" neſs of God leadeth thee to Repentance) after
" the Hardneſs and Impenitency of thine own
" Heart, treaſureſt up to thyſelf Wrath againſt
" the Day of Wrath, and Revelation of the
" righteous Judgment of God? [I ſay, the righte-
" ous Judgment of God; for, this, aſſure your-
" ſelves that] (*x*) in the Day, when God, accord-
" ing to the Tenor and Purport of that Goſpel
" which I preach, ſhall judge the Secrets of Men
" by Jeſus Chriſt, he will render to every Man
" according to his Deeds; to them, who [having
" (*y*) laid hold of the Means of Salvation now of-
" fered

(*x*) That the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe from *verſe* 11, to *verſe* 17. is *Parenthetical*, in divers Places, any one muſt obſerve, who will carefully read it over; though in ſtating the Connexion, there may, perhaps, be ſome Difficulty. To me, the Senſe ſeems to be moſt clear, by joining *verſe* 16, to *verſe* 10. which is the Method I have followed in the Paraphraſe above.

(*y*) That the Perſons here ſpoken of, as thoſe upon whom God would beſtow *Eternal Life*, are thoſe who ſhould *believe* and *obey the Goſpel*, I have already noted in my *Appeal* p. 54, 56. *& ſeq.* and, in this, I have ſome good Commentators on my Side. The main Reaſon I go upon (as you may there ſee) is to this Effect, *viz.* That both *Jew* and *Gentile*, without the Goſpel, are by the Apoſtle declared to be in a State of *Sin* and *Condemnation*: The Promiſe of Eternal Life, cannot here be ſuppoſed to be annexed to a mere *Nullity*, but, if it be made to thoſe, who *patiently continued in well-doing* under the *Moral Law* (or indeed under the *Law* of *Moſes*, without the Grace of the Goſpel) it is then, in the Apoſtle's Account, annexed to a mere *Nullity*, becauſe in his Account there were *no ſuch Perſons*. Nor can the Conſideration of *Repentance* have here any Place, becauſe, (as you will ſee more fully by and-by,) the Goſpel is the *only* Method propounded, by which *Remiſſion* of *Sins*, which is the *Benefit* of Repentance, was to be obtained. The Thing, therefore, *directly* intended by the Apoſtle,

" fered by the Gospel, shall] by patient Continu-
" ance in well-doing, seek for Glory and Honour, and
" Immortality, Eternal Life; But to them who,
" being led on by a Spirit of Strife and Contention,
" in Obedience to their fleshly Appetites, shall
" reject these Overtures of Mercy, Indignation and
" Wrath, Tribulation and Anguish; [I say, In-
" dignation and Wrath, Tribulation and An-
" guish] upon every Soul, that doth Evil, of the
" *Jew* first, and also of the *Gentile*, *Ver.* 2, to 10.
" For, there is no Respect of Persons with God.
" Whoever he be that sinneth, to him the Wrath
" of God is due; and therefore, (z) as many as
" have

Apostle, must be this, *viz.* That God would give *eternal Life* to those, who, *in consequence* of their having *embraced* the *Promise* of God, offering *Pardon* and *Reconciliation* by *Jesus Christ*, should, *by patient Continuance*, *in well-doing*; *seek for Glory*, &c. And, in a Sense correspondent to this, must the *Threatning* be interpreted, as I have also observed. Give me leave only thus far to explain myself, as to say, That though this was what the Apostle *directly* and *primarily* intended in this Place, yet neither must the *Promise*, nor the *Threatning*, be *so* limited to those to whom the Gospel of Christ was or should be offered, as not to be supposed *virtually* to include the *one*; all those *good Men* in every Age, who have (like *Abraham*) accepted of the *Overtures* of *Mercy* propounded by God (which, as will hereafter be explained, is, in a *general Sense* to *embrace* the *Gospel*); and the *other*, all those who have either *rejected* these *Overtures*, or without them, have lived in a Neglect of, or an Opposition to that *Light* which God has given them. For the *Threatning* is extended to *every Soul that doth Evil*; which must be understood in a Latitude proportionable to that which the Apostle had before said *Chap.* i. *Verse* 18. *viz.* That *the Wrath of God is revealed against all Ungodliness and Unrighteousness of Men.* In which Place, it is plain, that the *Gentiles* are considered not as under the *Overtures* of *Grace*, but as under the *Light* of *Nature*.

(z) It may be proper for those who are now-a-days so fond of believing, that at the Day of Judgment every Man shall be tryed by the Law under which he has lived, and all alike either saved or condemned according as they shall be found to have behaved

" have ſinned without the Law of *Moſes*, ſhall " periſh without the Law; and as many as have " ſinned under the Law, ſhall be condemned by " the Law: [The *Jews* will certainly have nothing " to plead from their having had the Law] For, " it is not barely the Hearing of the Law, but " the Doing of the Law that muſt juſtify. [Nor " will the *Gentiles* have any Thing to plead from " their *not* having had the Law;] For, though " they have not the Law, they have that within " themſelves which ſupplies the Place of the Law " [ſo far, I mean, as is enough to make them " inexcuſable] thoſe ſame Duties which the *Jews* " are taught by their Law, being (*a*) taught " them

---

behaved themſelves with reſpect to that Law, *i. e.* that the Law under which every Man has lived, ſhall be to him as well the Law of *Salvation*, as the Law of *Condemnation*; It may be proper, I ſay, for ſuch, to attend carefully to the Force of theſe Words, as what will ſhew, that their Notion receives no Countenance from this Place. For the Apoſtle doth not ſay, that as many as have *obeyed* or *repented*, either without or under the Law, ſhall be *acquitted* either by or without the Law (which, without doubt, he would have ſaid, if he had intended to teach any ſuch Doctrine) but only this, That as many as have *ſinned*, either with or without the Law, ſhall be *condemned* with or without the Law; and this with a manifeſt Deſign to ſhew, that all having *ſinned*, all therefore had need to come to Chriſt for Juſtification. This brings the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe to a due Coherency, and makes him argue like himſelf. But 'tis making him a very ſorry Reaſoner indeed, to ſuppoſe, that in an Argument which was intended to ſhew that Juſtification was to be had only *by Faith* in Chriſt, he ſhould lay it down as one Part of the Premiſes from whence he was to draw his Concluſion, that all Laws are in themſelves *alike* with reſpect to Salvation, and, conſequently, that thoſe who never heard of the Goſpel, might, at the laſt Day, as well be juſtified *without* it.

(*a*) The Greek is ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη — φύσει τὰ τῆς νόμε ποιῶ; And the Remark which I have heretofore made upon it, I think, is juſt, *viz.* That by this the Apoſtle did not mean to aſſert, that the *Gentiles* had any of them *fulfilled* the *Moral* Law (becauſe this contradicts what he has aſſerted over and over, *viz.* that *all* were

" them by the *Light* of *Nature*; and their " Conſciences, reproving them when they do amiſs, " and acquitting them when they do well, being " as faithful and ſure a Guide as any written " Law can be, *Ver.* 11, to 16. But as to you " Jews in particular, You, of all others, have the " leaſt Reaſon to place any Confidence in your " Law: You ſay yourſelves, that being inſtructed " out of the Law, you perfectly well underſtand " the Will of God, and are able alſo to teach " it to others; and this is what you are very " proud of. [But do you not ſee that this Boaſt- " ing is your Reproach? What!] Art thou who " art qualified to teach others, not able to teach " thyſelf? Thou that preacheſt, A Man ſhould not " ſteal, doſt thou ſteal? Thou that ſayſt, A Man " ſhould not commit Adultery, doſt thou commit " Adultery? Thou that abhorreſt Idols, doſt " thou commit Sacrilege? Are not theſe and " ſuch like notorious Violations of that very " Law upon which ye ſo much value yourſelves, " both a Shame to yourſelves, and a Diſhonour to " God, whoſe Name, by this Means, is blaſ- " phemed among the Gentiles? *Ver.* 17, to 24, " [Nor will it avail to ſay, that you are *circumciſed*, " and obſerve the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* of the " Law] Circumciſion indeed profiteth, if thou " keep the Law; but if thou be a Tranſgreſſor " of the Law, it will be the ſame Thing in Effect, " and as to your State and Condition before God, " as if you were not circumciſed. Yea, ſo little is " there in this Pretence, that the very *Gentiles*

---

were *Sinners*) but only, that the *Moral* Duties of the Law were underſtood and practiſed among the *Gentiles*, as, indeed, they were, though all had tranſgreſſed in many Inſtances.

" [whom

" [whom ye so much despise] would, upon Supposition that they had *fulfilled* the *natural* Law, " be accepted of God *without* Circumcision, whilst " you, who are under the *written* Law, and are " *Sinners* against that Law, shall stand condemned *with* Circumcision. For the End of the outward Circumcision in the Flesh, was, to lead " Men to the inward Circumcision of the Heart; " and therefore, he who is without the latter, " cannot be a true *Jew*; he cannot be one of those " to whom the Promises belong, merely in Virtue " of the former, *Verse* 25, *to the End of the* " *Chapter*. But if this be the Case, you will say, " what Advantage then hath the *Jew?* or, what is " the Benefit of Circumcision? *Chap.* iii. *Verse* 1." This Objection the Apostle considers under two distinct Views, 1st. With respect to the *Means* and *Opportunities*, which God had vouchsafed the *Jews* above the *Gentiles*; And, 2. With respect to the present *State* or *Condition* of both, as to their *Justification* before God. To the Question under the *First* of these Views, he answers, that the Advantage which the *Jews* had above the *Gentiles*, was " much every way; chiefly (says he) be- " cause that unto them were committed the Ora- " cles of God; they lived under a clear and ex- " press Revelation of the Divine Will, and there- " by enjoy'd those Degrees of Light, which the " *Gentiles* had not, *verse* 2. [And although the " *Jews* did not make a right Use of these Means, " yet were not these Advantages therefore the less.] " For what if some did not believe? shall their " Unbelief make the Faith of God without effect? " God forbid; yea, let God be true, and every " Man a Lyar, as it is written, that thou might- " est be justified in thy Saying, and clear when " thou art judged. The Gift of God to them was " the very same, how small soever the Effect of

" it

" it was through their Unbelief; For their Unbe-
" lief could not disannul the Promises of God.
" But, on the other Hand, their Unbelief, when com-
" pared with the Means they were under, would
" render them inexcusable, and justify the Righ-
" teousness of God in his Dealings with them, *ver.*
" 3, 4." This Reasoning suggested an Objection to the Apostle's Mind, which he stops a little to answer; and then comes to consider the Question under the *Second* View before mentioned, *viz.* Whether the Jews had made such an Use of the Advantages, which they had above the Gentiles, as to be really in a better State, with respect to Justification, than the Gentiles were; as to which he again declares, that there was no Difference between them, all of them being Sinners. For thus he proceeds, *ver.* 9. " What then? Are we better
" than they? Are the Jews in a more hopeful
" State before God, than the Gentiles are? No, in
" no wise; for we have before proved against
" both, that they are all under Sin. As it is writ-
" ten, *There is none Righteous, no, not one;*"
which are the Words of the Psalmist, whereby he continues the Description of the Sinful Estate of the *Jews* (as he had before that of the *Gentiles*) to *ver.* 19. where he closes the whole with this general Conclusion, *viz.* " That every Mouth was
" stopped, and all the World become guilty before
" God." What now is the Inference which he draws from hence? Why, you have it in the next Verse, " Therefore by the Deeds of the Law, there
" shall no Flesh be justified in his Sight. For, by
" the Law is the Knowledge of Sin." That is to say, By the Law all stand convicted of Sin, and therefore by the Law none can be justified. But from this wretched and miserable Condition, God was now pleased to offer a Releasement; for thus he proceeds; " But now God's Method of Justi-
" fication,

" fication, without that Obedience to the Law " [which all have failed in;] of which Method " both the Law and the Prophets have born Wit- " neſs; [This Method, I ſay] is now made mani- " feſt, to wit, the Juſtification which is by *Faith* in " *Jeſus Chriſt*, unto all, and upon all that believe. " [I ſay, unto *all* and upon *all*] For there is no " manner of Difference in this reſpect between *Jew* " and *Gentile*; *all* have ſinned, and come ſhort of " the Glory of God; and, therefore, *all* muſt be " juſtified freely by the Grace of God, through " the Redemption which is by Jeſus Chriſt; whom " God (who is patient and long ſuffering towards " us) hath now ſet forth to be a Propitiation for " *all*, through Faith in his Blood, to declare his " own way of bringing us to Juſtification by the " Forgiveneſs of our paſt Sins, that he might be " juſt [in fulfilling what he hath promiſed] and " the Juſtifier of him that believeth in Jeſus. Thus " then all Foundation of Boaſting is intirely re- " moved; not indeed by the Law of *Works*" (according to which, as the Apoſtle by-and-by obſerves, whoever is juſtified, hath *whereof to glory:*) " But by the Law of *Faith*, ver. 21, to 26." And now we are got to that Paſſage, which is the Subject of the preſent Diſpute, and which I ſhall e'er long very fully explain; " Therefore we " conclude, that a Man is juſtified by Faith, with- " out the Deeds of the Law." The *Jews* were to be juſtified by *Faith* in Chriſt; and thus, the Apoſtle again inculcates, ſhould the *Gentiles* be juſtified as well as they; For, " Is God the God of the " *Jews* only? Is he not alſo of the *Gentiles?* Yes, " of the *Gentiles* alſo. Seeing it is one God who " ſhall juſtify the *Circumciſion* by *Faith*, and the " *Uncircumciſion* through *Faith*. Nor let it be ſaid, " that we make void the Law through Faith; for,

" in

" in Truth, we eſtabliſh the Law, *verſe* 21. *to the* " *End of the Chapter.* "

The Subſtance of the Apoſtle's Reaſonings, then, is thus far unqueſtionably clear, *viz.* That both *Jews* and *Gentiles* being *Sinners*, the *latter* againſt the Law of *Nature*, and the *former* againſt the Law of *Moſes*, there was therefore a Neceſſity upon both, to lay hold of God's Offer of *Pardon* and *Reconciliation* by *Jeſus Chriſt*; of which, *Faith* in Chriſt, was now made the *only* Condition. And this comes fully up to the Senſe of the Propoſition at firſt laid down, and which was to be proved; to wit, That *the Goſpel is the Power of God unto Salvation, to every one that believeth.* The Point, therefore, being now made good, he proceeds, in the next Place, to illuſtrate it by the Example of *Abraham*, which was a very proper way of arguing againſt the *Jews*, who owning him to be the *Head* from whom they derived all their *Privileges*, could therefore in reaſon expect to be juſtified no otherwiſe, than as he was juſtified. Concerning *Abraham*, then, the Apoſtle thus puts the Queſtion, *Chap.* 4. " What ſhall we ſay then, " that *Abraham* our Father, hath found according " to the Fleſh? How, I pray, ſtood the Caſe " with him? Was he juſtified by *Works*, or was " he not? *Verſe* 1. If he *was*, it muſt be owned, " that he had whereof to glory; but it is plain, " that before God, he had nothing whereof to " glory, nor was he therefore juſtified by Works. " For what ſaith the Scripture? Abraham *believed* " *God, and it was accounted to him for Righteouſ-* " *neſs.* [Does not this make good what I ſay? Cer- " tainly it does.] For to him that *worketh*, i. e. " to him who *fulfilleth* the Law, and ſo juſtifieth " himſelf by his *Works*, to him, indeed, the be- " ſtowing the *Reward* annexed to Juſtification, " becomes a Matter of *Debt*, and not of *Grace*;

" [And,

" [And, therefore, had this been the Caſe of " *Abraham*, he would, as I ſaid juſt now, have " had *whereof to glory*. But his Caſe was plain- " ly otherwiſe; his *Faith*, you ſee, was *counted* to " him for *Righteouſneſs*, which ſuppoſeth, that he " had *not fulfilled* the Law] For *then* only is *Faith* " *counted for Righteouſneſs*, when he who hath " *not* fulfilled the Law, is accepted on the Ac- " count of his *believing* the Promiſes of God, juſti- " fying him whilſt he is a Tranſgreſſor of the Law, " *ver.* 2—5. Accordingly, *David* deſcribing to us " the *Bleſſedneſs* of the Righteous Man, ſpeaks of " him, not as of one who had *fulfilled* the Law, but as " of one who was juſtified by the free *Mercy* of " God, through the *Forgiveneſs* of Sins. Saying, " *Bleſſed are they whoſe Iniquities are forgiven, and* " *whoſe Sins are covered; Bleſſed is the Man to* " *whom the Lord will not impute Sin*, ver. 6—8. " I ask then, Cometh this Bleſſedneſs upon " the *Circumciſion* only, or upon the *Uncircum-* " *ciſion* alſo? [Since it is ſo plain, that all who " have heretofore been juſtified, were juſtified, not " by their *Works*, but by their *Faith* in the Pro- " miſes of God, offering Pardon and Reconciliation; " do you not think, that the *Gentiles*, if they ac- " cept of the Overtures of God's Mercy made " by Jeſus Chriſt, ſhall be juſtified, *(i)* as well " as you? Why, in this Point alſo, the Caſe of

---

(i) There were two Things, chiefly, which prejudiced the *Jews* againſt the Goſpel. The one was, that it was a Charge of Inſufficiency againſt their Law, which they held in ſo great Eſteem, as to expect Juſtification by it; and the other, that it ſet the *Gentiles* upon the ſame Foot with themſelves, to whom they thought the Promiſes of God were abſolutely confined. Theſe two Points, tho' very diſtinct in themſelves, the Apoſtle (who, ſeldom obſerves Strictneſs of Method) frequently intermixes in this Diſpute, as any attentive Reader will eaſily perceive.

" *Abraham*,

" *Abraham*, will give you Satisfaction;] For we " say, that *Faith*, was reckoned unto *Abraham* for " Righteousness. How then was it reckoned? " When he was in *Circumcision*, or, when he was " in *Uncircumcision*? Was it before he was circum- " cised, that he was justified by his Faith? or was it " *after*? 'Tis plain that it was *before*; and that he " received the Sign of *Circumcision*, as the *Seal* or " *Evidence* of his being justified, in virtue of that " *Faith*, which he had yet being *Uncircumcised*. " [To be justified by *Faith*, therefore, is not a Pri- " vilege annexed peculiarly to *Circumcision*; for " if it were, *Abraham*, could not have been justi- " fied, before he was *circumcised*. But you see, " that *Abraham* was justified, before he was *cir-* " *cumcised*;] and in this he is a Pattern and Ex- " ample to *all* that believe, who shall be justified, " tho' they be *not* circumcised; and a Pattern also " to those who *are* circumcised, who shall be justi- " fied, likewise, if they are not *only* circumcised, " but walk also, in the Steps of that *Faith* of our " Father *Abraham*, which he had being yet uncir- " cumcised; [that is, if, according to his Example, " they embrace the Promises of God, and conse- " quently, do accept of those Offers, which are now " made by the Gospel.] *Ver.* 9—12. For the " Promise, that he be should the Heir of the World, " was not made to *Abraham*, or his Seed, through " Obedience to the Law (which was not then in " being, nor was given 'till above Four hundred " Years after, *Gal.* iii. 17.) but through the Righ- " teousness which was by *Faith*; which it will " be absurd to say, if they, and they only, who " are of the Law, be Heirs. Yea, upon this Foot " the Promise itself will be of none effect [because " none will have any claim to it;] For the Law " worketh Wrath [*i. e.* by or thro' the Law all " are become subject to Wrath; and, therefore, by

" the Law, there can be no Right to the Promiſe. " He who claims a Promiſe, *by* the Law, can " claim it no otherwiſe, than in virtue of a *Legal* " *Obedience*; but *Legal Obedience* there is none, " for, as I ſaid before, all have ſinned. So far, " therefore, is it, from being true, that the In- " heritance is to be obtained by the Law, that " the Law is, *(k)* accidentally become the Means " of ſetting us at the greater diſtance from it, as " having been the Occaſion of involving us under " that Guilt, which we could never have incurred, " if the Law had never been given. Sinners in- " deed we ſhould have been, but we could not have " been Sinners againſt the Law;] for where there " is no Law, there is no Tranſgreſſion, *ver.* 1.— " 15. But therefore hath God appointed that the " Inheritance ſhould be of Faith, that we might " have no Merit to plead, but that it might, as I " ſaid before, be the free Gift of his Grace; and " to the Intent alſo, that the Promiſe might be " ſure to all the Seed of *Abraham*; not to that " only which is of the Law, but to that alſo, " which follows the Faith of *Abraham*, who, ac- " cording to what is written of him (*viz.* That " he ſhould be *the Father of many Nations*, and not " of one Nation only] is the Father of us all; " even of all who believe, whether they be of the " Law, or not of the Law; in like manner as the " God in whom he believed, is the Father of all " *Gentiles*, as well as *Jews*, *ver.* 16, 17. It was " that ſignal and eminent Faith of his, by which " without the leaſt doubt or heſitation, not only " without, but againſt all the Grounds of Human " Expectation, he embraced the Promiſes of God, " which was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs.

(k) Compare theſe Verſes with *Chap.* 7. ver. 7, to 12.

" And

" And it was not written for his Sake only, that " it was imputed, but for ours alſo, to whom " Faith ſhall likewiſe be imputed, for Righteouſ- " neſs, if we believe in Him, who raiſed up our " Lord Jeſus from the Dead, who was delivered " for our Offences, and was raiſed again for our " Juſtification, " *Ver.* 18. *to the End.*

§. XVI. And here the Apoſtle's Argument receives its final Concluſion; in explaining which, if I have not (and I dare not be poſitive that I have) hit upon the exact Meaning of every particular Paſſage, I am confident, that I have not erred from the main Scope and Deſign of the whole, which (as I before ſaid) was to ſhew, that both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, being *all* Sinners, they had, therefore, *all* need to come to *Chriſt* for *Juſtification*; and that if they did, the *one* ſhould be juſtified, as well as the *other*. Let us now ſee whether the Queſtions above propounded, will not, from what has been ſaid, admit of ſatisfactory Anſwers. And, *Firſt*, If it be inquired, *What that Law is*, whoſe *Works* or *Deeds* the Apoſtle excludes from *Juſtification*; I anſwer, That the *Jewiſh Law*, or *Law* of *Moſes*, is directly and primarily intended; For *the Law* is not ſo much as once mentioned, 'till we come to *Chap.* ii. *ver.* 12. where the Apoſtle is arguing againſt the *Jews*, who were *under the Law*, in contra-diſtinction to the *Gentiles*, who, he ſays, were *without the Law*. In what follows, he is ſpeaking ſtill to the ſame Perſons, and of the ſame *Law*, and (that I may juſt take notice of it by the Way) whenever ὁ νόμος, *the Law*, is indefinitely uſed, the Word, in St. *Paul*'s Language eſpecially, has a peculiar Emphaſis, to denote the *Law* of *Moſes*, as every one muſt have obſerved, who has read his Epiſtles with an ordinary Care. But foraſmuch as the *Law* of *Moſes* was partly *Moral*, and partly *Ceremonial*;

it may, therefore, be farther asked, Whether the Apoſtle's Meaning was to exclude, *abſolutely*, the *whole* Law, from Juſtification, or, ſo much only of it, as was *Ceremonial*; which I ſo much the rather mention, becauſe ſome Writers, who have treated upon this Subject, have ſuppoſed, that the latter only was intended. And this, it muſt be owned (were it true) would be a very ſhort and eaſy way of ending the Diſpute, there being not the leaſt Appearance of a Contradiction, in affirming, that we are *juſtified* by the *Works* of *Evangelical Righteouſneſs*, and denying, that we are *juſtified* by an *Obſervance* of the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* of the *Moſaic Law*. But this Notion I can by no means agree to; not only becauſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Law, *abſolutely*, and without any diſtinction, but becauſe the whole drift of his Reaſoning ſhews, that it was his Deſign to exclude the *Moral*, as well as the *Ceremonial* Law from Juſtification. The Reaſon why the Apoſtle excludes the *Law* from *Juſtification*, is (as I have often ſaid, and as you very plainly ſee) becauſe *all were Sinners* againſt it. Now this Reaſon extends itſelf to the *whole* Law, both *Moral* and *Ceremonial*; yea, it was principally true with reſpect to the *Moral*; for the *Jews* were more apt to be backward in *Moral* Duties than they were in *External* and *Ritual* Performances. I obſerve farther, that all the *Tranſgreſſions* mentioned *chap.* iii. from *ver.* 10, to *ver.* 19. and on the account of which, the *Law* is excluded from *Juſtification*, are Breaches of the *Moral* Law; from whence it follows, that the *Moral* Law muſt be intended; And, of what *Law* can the Apoſtle be underſtood to ſpeak, *ver.* 31. where he asks, *Do we then make void the Law through Faith?* (i. e. by aſcribing, that *Juſtification* to *Faith*, which we deny to the *Law*) *Yea, we eſtabliſh the Law.* Does the Preaching of *Faith*, think you, eſtabliſh the *Ritual*

Ritual Law of *Moſes*? Finally, the Apoſtle, by one and the ſame Argument, excludes the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews* from Juſtification. But the *Gentiles* were only under the *Moral* Law, and, therefore, the *Moral* Law, as well as the *Ceremonial*, muſt be excluded from *Juſtification*. Now then,

§. XVII. *Secondly*; If you aſk, *In what Senſe* the Apoſtle excludes the *Works* of the *Law* from *Juſtification*? I anſwer, That they are excluded no otherwiſe, than conſider'd as *abſtracted* from *Evangelical Grace*, i. e. from the *Grace* or *Mercy* of God, freely declaring, or promiſing Acceptance through the *Forgiveneſs* of *Sin*. Concerning *Works* performed *under* and *in conſequence of* this Grace, (of which Sort, are the *Works* of *Chriſtian Obedience*; concerning this Sort of *Works*, I ſay) the Apoſtle ſays not one Word; yea, the very Nature of the Argument, ſhuts them out of the Aſſertion: For a Man's having *ſinned* againſt a *Law*, can be no Reaſon why he cannot be *juſtified* by that *Law*, any otherwiſe than as that *Law* is ſuppoſed to require a *ſtrict* and *punctual* Obedience; or (which is the ſame thing) any otherwiſe than it is ſuppoſed not to admit of *Forgiveneſs*. For in caſe a *Law* does *not* require a *ſtrict* and *punctual* Obedience, 'tis plain, that a Man may be *juſtified* by it, though he be a *Tranſgreſſor*. By *the Law of Works*, then, the Apoſtle plainly meant, the Law of *perfect Obedience*, and by *the Law of Faith*, that Law by which we are accepted through or on Condition of Faith, *without* a *perfect Obedience*. And when he ſaid, that by the *Deeds of the Law no Fleſh ſhould be juſtified*, or, (which is all one) that *a Man is juſtified without the Deeds of the Law*, his Deſign was only to teach the *Jews*, that none of them could be juſtified by any thing

that could be pleaded by, or according to the Law, *antecedently* to the Grace of God, freely imputing Righteouſneſs to them, through the Forgiveneſs of their Sins. He conſiders the *Law* as the Rule of Life, enjoining or commanding certain Duties to be performed; and he ſhews them that they were all *Sinners* againſt this Law, to ſhew them, that they had all Need of *Mercy*; and all this with a Deſign to lead them to that Goſpel, by which *Mercy* was now freely offer'd to them.

§. XVIII. This is the Senſe to which the Nature of the Apoſtle's Argument unavoidably carries us. Now there were two groſs and capital Errors which prevailed among the *Jews* at that Time, and which made this Way of Arguing both proper and neceſſary. The firſt (for which they were ſeverely reproved by our Saviour, *Matt.* xxiii. 23, and in ſeveral other Places) was, that it was (*l*) of little or no conſequence, whether they obſerved the *Moral* Precepts of the Law, provided they ſtuck cloſe to the *Ritual*; the other, that whatever Sins were committed againſt the Law, they were to be fully expiated by thoſe *Sacrifices* which the Law appointed: So that, upon the whole, the *Jews* were as well ignorant of the *ſinful State* and *Condition* they were under, as of the *true Means* of procuring a *Releaſement* from it. But the Apoſtle endeavours to convince them of both; ſetting before them, in the firſt Place, their heinous Violations of the Eternal Law of Righteouſneſs, in Conſequence of which they were become obnoxious to *Wrath* and *Condemnation*, and

(*l*) See this Point ſpoken to at large, Bull. Harm. Diſſert. Poſt. Cap. 16. 17.

more

more inexcuſable, even than the Gentiles themſelves; and then, in the next Place, directing them to the *Blood* of *Jeſus Chriſt*, the great *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, by which, and by which *only*, thoſe who *believed* in him, ſhould obtain Remiſſion. This ſending them, I ſay, to Chriſt, as the only true *Propitiation*, was a very manifeſt, though tacit, Charge of *Inſufficiency* againſt the *Legal Sacrifices* to put away Sin; which is what the Apoſtle very plainly told the *Jews* of upon another Occaſion: *Be it known unto you, Men and Brethren*, ſays he, *that through this Man* (Jeſus Chriſt) *is preached unto you the Forgiveneſs of Sins, and by Him, all that believe are juſtified from all Things* (i. e. from Tranſgreſſions) *from which ye could not be juſtified by the Law of* Moſes; i. e. (for ſo with the learned Doctor *Hammond*, I underſtand the Place) of which thoſe ſeveral Ways of *Expiation* appointed by the Law, could procure no Remiſſion, *Acts* xiii. 38. I muſt here obſerve, that when I ſpeak of *Remiſſion*, I mean, a *perfect* or *plenary* Remiſſion, i. e. a Remiſſion which reaches the *Conſcience* of the Offender, and clears him from the Imputation of Guilt; for ſome Sort of *Remiſſion* muſt be allowed to the *Legal Sacrifices*. But of what ſort was it? Why, it was a *Temporal* Remiſſion, or a *Releaſement* from certain *Temporal Puniſhments*, which were threatned to the Tranſgreſſors of the Law: This, I ſay, was all that the *Legal Sacrifices* could procure; and this, (by the way) they did only in certain Caſes; for *ſome* Tranſgreſſions there were, which were not at all to be expiated by *Sacrifice*. But farther than this, they had no Effect in any Caſe: For tho' the Puniſhment was remitted, the *Guilt* of the *Sin* ſtill remained not to be done away, otherwiſe than in virtue of the one great *Sacrifice*, which was to be offered up *at the End of the World*, of which the *Sacrifices* under the *Law*, were but *Types*

and *Shadows*. And thus the Author to the *Hebrews* (who is generally ſuppoſed to have been St. *Paul* himſelf) ſtates the Caſe: *For the Law* (ſays he) *having a Shadow of good Things to come, and not the very Image of the Things, can never, with thoſe Sacrifices which they offered Year by Year, continually make the Comers thereunto perfect* —— *For it is not poſſible that the Blood of Bulls and Goats ſhould take away Sin*, Chap. x. 1, 4. *It ſanctified* indeed (as he tells us, *Chap.* ix. 9, 13.) *to the purifying of the Fleſh*; but it *could not make him that did the Service perfect, as pertaining to the Conſcience.* This he aſcribes only to the *Blood* of *Chriſt* (verſe 14.) who having offered himſelf as *a Sacrifice for Sin, by that one Offering, for ever perfected them that are ſanctified.* But was there then, you'll aſk, no *perfect Remiſſion* to be had under the *Law?* Yes, moſt certainly; For he who is *juſtified* before God, muſt have this *Remiſſion*: Now *Abraham*, you ſee, was *juſtified*, and the Apoſtle tells us, that in virtue of the *Covenant* made with him, and his *Seed after him*, of which *Circumciſion* was the *Sign*, or *Seal*, ALL of the *Circumciſion* who *walked in the Steps of their Father* Abraham, were *juſtified* as well as *he*. And this is the very thing which he is all this while aiming at, even to convince and ſatisfy the *Jews*, by what Method *Abraham* was, and all after him, were, and muſt be, *juſtified*; which being the very Method propounded by the Goſpel, they would, when once they underſtood it, inſtantly perceive the Vanity of truſting to *Legal Performances*, and the Neceſſity they were under of coming to the Goſpel. How, then, was *Abraham* juſtified? Why, not by his *Works*; Not becauſe he was not a *Sinner*; but, by his humble and ready Submiſſion to the Will of God, offering him, upon thoſe Terms, *Favour* and *Reconciliation*. And how were his *Children* under

the

the *Law* juſtified? Why, not becauſe they were not *Sinners* neither; nor yet by the *Legal Sacrifices*, which could not *take away Sin*; but by ſubmitting themſelves alſo to the Will of God, and truſting to his *Promiſes*, according to the Example of *Abraham*. Now this, I ſay, is the very Method which was propounded by the Goſpel. For what is the Goſpel, but a Declaration of the *Promiſes* of God, in and through *Jeſus Chriſt*, now *made manifeſt* (*when the Fulneſs of Time was come*) to be *the Author of eternal Salvation?* If then they would be juſtified with faithful *Abraham*, they muſt follow the *Faith* of *Abraham*, and laying aſide all Confidence either in their own Innocency, or in any other Method of Reconciliation, *obey* God's *Call* and *embrace* his *Promiſes*, as *Abraham* did.

§. XIX. Upon this Foot, the Apoſtle's Reaſoning is plain and concluſive; upon any other, it is paſt my Skill to make it ſo. For, on the one Hand, whatever it concludes *againſt* the *Jews*, in Caſe they accepted *not* the Goſpel, the ſame it more ſtrongly concludes *againſt* the *Gentiles*; and, on the other Hand, whatever it concludes *in Favour* of the *Jews*, in caſe they *did* accept the Goſpel, the ſame alſo it concludes *in Favour* of the *Gentiles*; and the Concluſion, with reſpect to both, is, that which the Apoſtle undertook to prove, to wit, that the Goſpel is the *only Method* of *Salvation*. To come now, therefore, to the Point; Since it appears, that the Apoſtle, when he ſays, that we are *not juſtified by Works*, excludes *Works* from *Juſtification*, no otherwiſe than conſider'd as *antecedent* to, or *abſtracted* from, the *Grace* of God promiſing Acceptance through the *Forgiveneſs* of *Sin*; 'tis plain, that this Aſſertion leaves us under the utmoſt Liberty to ſuppoſe, that

that *under*, or *in conjunction with*, this *Grace*, Works, may be *neceſſary* to *Juſtification*. For, there is no Inconſiſtency, in ſaying, that we cannot be juſtified by Works *without* the merciful *Forgiveneſs* of God, and in affirming, that *Works* are, in a certain Degree, the *Condition* upon which that *Forgiveneſs* is offer'd. Now this is manifeſtly our Caſe; For, we acknowledge, that we are all of us *Sinners*, and conſequently, that we cannot be *juſtified without* that *Pardon* which is freely offer'd us by and through *Jeſus Chriſt*: But then we ſay, that this *Pardon* is offer'd us no otherwiſe than upon *Condition* of our *Obedience*, i. e. our *future* or *final* Obedience, and in this Senſe it is, that we affirm, that *Works* are neceſſary to our *Juſtification*: We aſcribe *Juſtification* to *Works*, therefore, not conſider'd as *abſtracted* from *Evangelical Grace*, but conſider'd as *under* or *in Conjunction with* it. In which Account we ſhall agree with St. *Paul*, as St. *Paul* will alſo agree with himſelf, when he ſays, that we are *juſtified by Faith*, if under the Word *Faith* he includes *Works* of *Evangelical* Obedience. Now, that he *does*, has been already ſhewn, and will yet more fully appear by the Caſe of *Abraham*. For, let us conſider what it was by which he was juſtified; Was it his Faith, *alone?* Was it a *mere Belief* in the *Promiſes* of God, conſider'd as *diſtinct* from its proper and genuine *Effects?* Or, was it his Faith *in conjunction with* that *Obedience* to the Divine Will, which he was directed to by his *Faith?* Why, common Senſe might ſufficiently convince any Man, that it was the *latter*. But if you would know how the *Holy Ghoſt* has reſolved this Queſtion, the Author to the *Hebrews* will inform you; who having obſerved (*Chap.* x. *Verſe* 38.) *that the Juſt ſhall live by Faith*, goes on *Chap.* xi.) to exemplify it in this Manner. *By Faith* Abel *offer'd unto God, a more excellent Sacrifice than*

than Cain, *by which he obtained Witneſs that he was Righteous*; *God teſtifying of his Gifts* —— *By Faith*, Noah *being warned of God of Things not ſeen as yet, moved with Fear, prepared an Ark, to the Saving of his Houſe, by the which he* —— *became Heir of the Righteouſneſs which is by Faith. By Faith*, Abraham, *when he was called to go out into a Place which he ſhould after receive for an Inheritance, obeyed* —— *ſojourned in the Land of Promiſe, as in a ſtrange Country* —— *offered up his only begotten Son, of whom it was ſaid, That in* Iſaac *ſhall thy Seed be called.* Thus the Apoſtle: And now, pray, aſk your ſelf; What was it by which *Abel* obtained Witneſs that he was Righteous? Why, you are expreſly told, that it was his *Offering* (through Faith) a more excellent Sacrifice than *Cain*. Again, What was it by which *Noah* became Heir of the Righteouſneſs which is by Faith? Why, you are alſo expreſly told, that it was his *preparing* (through Faith) an Ark to the ſaving of his Houſe. So that neither of theſe were juſtified merely by their *Faith*, but by their *Faith* in conjunction with their *Obedience*. And was not the Caſe of *Abraham* the ſame? Muſt it not be ſaid of him likewiſe, that he was juſtified not merely by his *Faith*, but by his *Obedience* to the Divine Call? If you can yet doubt, hear St. *James*, *Was not* Abraham *our Father juſtified by Works, when he had offered* Iſaac *his Son upon the Altar?* He anſwers himſelf, in the very next Words, βλέπεις, *Thou ſeeſt* how the Caſe ſtands; *His Faith wrought with his Works, and by Works was his Faith made perfect*; *and the Scripture was fulfilled, which ſaith*, Abraham *believed God, and it was imputed unto him for Righteouſneſs*, Jam. ii. 21, 22, 23.

§. XX. But concerning the Doctrine of St. *James*, enough has been ſaid in the foregoing Part of

of this Diſcourſe; It was my Buſineſs now to ſhew, that St. *Paul* teaches the ſame Thing, which I hope I have done, and which I do not well ſee how it can be done, if the Method I have purſued be not admitted of. There are, beſides this, but Three Ways, by which a Reconciliation between theſe Two Apoſtles has ever been attempted. The *Firſt* ſuppoſes, that St. *Paul* ſpeaks of our Juſtification *before God*, and St. *James* of our Juſtification *before Man*, which has already been refuted. The *Second*, That whereas St. *Paul* ſpeaks of a *True* Faith, St. *James* ſpeaks of a *Falſe* and *Hypocritical* Faith. But againſt this there lie theſe unanſwerable Objections, *viz.* That the *Faith* which St. *James* ſpeaks of, is a *Faith* of which he *approves*, and which wants nothing but *Works* correſpondent to it, to make it *effectual* towards Juſtification. *Thou believeſt*, ſays he, *that there is one God*; *Thou doſt well*, Verſe 19. And Verſe 24. *Ye ſee then, that by Works a Man is juſtified, and not by Faith only*; which implies, as has before been obſerved, that *Faith*, though it be not the *Sole*, is yet a *partial* Cauſe of Juſtification. Now theſe Things cannot be affirmed of a *Falſe* or *Hypocritical* Faith, which in Truth is no Faith at all: For neither does it deſerve Praiſe, nor does it contribute any Thing to our Juſtification. Furthermore, the *Faith* of which St. *James* ſpeaks, is ſuch a *Faith* as *Abraham* had; and who will ſay, that the *Faith* of *Abraham* was *Falſe* and *Hypocritical?* This way, therefore, of ſolving the Difficulty, can by no means ſtand. Nor will they ſucceed better, who ſay, *Thirdly*, that whereas St. *Paul* ſpeaks of our *Firſt* Juſtification, *i. e.* of our firſt Admittance to the Grace and Favour of God, St. *James* ſpeaks of our *Second* and *Final* Juſtification; and, in conſequence of this Diſtinction, would have us believe, that with reſpect to the one, Faith *alone* is ſufficient, but that both

both *Faith* and *Obedience* are neceſſary to the other; For the Notion of *Juſtification* is the ſame, whatever State or Condition a Man is under, to wit, his being accounted or adjudged *Righteous* before God; and there is no more Reaſon to ſay, that we are *at firſt* accounted Righteous merely in virtue of our *Faith*, than there is to ſay, that we are ſo accounted merely in virtue of our *Faith*, at any Time *afterwards*. The *Firſt* Juſtification of a Chriſtian, is that which he receives when he is firſt made a Chriſtian, *i. e.* when he is made a *Member* of *Chriſt* by *Baptiſm*. Now *Baptiſm* is an Act of *Obedience*, and that *Repentance* which is neceſſary to qualify us for *Baptiſm*, is likewiſe an Act of *Obedience*; there is, therefore, the ſame Relation between *Obedience* and this *Firſt* Juſtification, that there is between *Obedience* and the *Second* or *Final* Juſtification. True it is, that *more* Duties are required of a Man *under* the Covenant, than are neceſſary to this Admiſſion *into* the Covenant; ſo that in this reſpect there is indeed a Difference between that which juſtifies us *at firſt*, and that which juſtifies us *afterwards*. But the Point is not merely, whether there is a Difference, but whether the Difference lies preciſely in this, that whereas *Faith* and *Obedience* are *both* neceſſary, as to the *Second* Juſtification, Faith *alone* is ſufficient as to the *Firſt*; and it is plain, that it doth *not*, becauſe *Obedience* is alike required in order to *both*. The particular Acts of *Obedience* may not indeed be the ſame in both Caſes, becauſe the *Meaſure* of *Obedience* is not the ſame. But *Faith* cannot be *alone* in either, but muſt be attended with ſuch an *Obedience*, as is proper to the State or Condition we are under.

§. XXI. It is then a very fair Preſumption (to ſay no more of it) that the foregoing Method of reconciling St. *Paul* and St. *James* is the true one, that

that no other rational Method can be thought of. And now having ſhewn what is the Scriptural Notion of *Saving* or *Juſtifying* Faith, it may be expected, perhaps, that I ſhould proceed to conſider the Opinions of thoſe who have explained it otherwiſe. Now this I ſhould be ready enough to do, if there were any one general Notion, that I could fix upon. But Error has no certain and ſtanding Rule; and ſo it is, that thoſe Divines who have contradicted the Truth in this particular, do not more differ from it, than they do from one another; not to ſay even from themſelves. But how widely diſtant ſoever they are, as to ſome particular Circumſtances, yet they all meet at the laſt (and ſo it muſt needs be) in one common Road of Darkneſs; and I muſt ſay, with the learned Biſhop *Bull*, that it requires (*m*) ὑπερβάλλον μέτρον ἀκριβείας, *a ſuperlative meaſure of Acuteneſs and Sagacity, to be able clearly to explain and reconcile what they ſay upon this Subject.* (*n*) To *hunger and thirſt after Righteouſneſs; to fly, to lay hold of, embrace, lean, reſt, roll upon, cleave unto God* or *Chriſt*, theſe are the Phraſes by which the Formality of *juſtifying Faith* is ſet forth differently, by different Writers; by which, if their Meaning were to deſcribe to us the Temper of a Man, under an intire Submiſſion to the Will of God, they would ſay as we ſay, *viz.* That we are juſtified not by Faith *alone*, but by *Faith* in conjunction with *Obedience*. But ſince this is what they do *not* intend, it can ſignify nothing to inquire what they *do*; 1. Becauſe upon this foot the Words can have no ſound Meaning at all; and, 2. Becauſe whatever it be that they are ſuppoſed to ſignify, we may be very ſure, from

(*m*) Ibid. Differt. prior *Cap.* 4. §. 4.

(*n*) Vid. *Ludov.* Le *Blanc* Theſ. de *Fid. Juſtif.* Nat. & Eſſentia.

what

what has been ſaid, that it is not that by which we are juſtified. But there is one Notion which I very clearly underſtand, and which it may be proper juſt to mention by Way of Caution; and that is, that *juſtifying Faith* conſiſts in a Man's being under an *abſolute Aſſurance*, that he is in a *State* of *Salvation*, or, which is all one, that he is *already juſtified*. This Notion, which, to the great Shame and Scandal of the Reformation, hath been maintained by many, even of our own Divines, appears, at the very firſt ſight, to be both abſurd and dangerous. The Danger of it appears from hence, that it makes the *Juſtification* and *Salvation* of Men, to depend not upon the Judgment of *God* concerning them, but upon *their own* Judgment concerning themſelves; ſo, that let a Man, on the one Hand, be never ſo wicked, he will yet be *juſtified*, if he can but have the Confidence to think that he is ſo; and, on the other Hand, let him be never ſo upright, he may yet *not* be juſtified, through ſome pitiable Miſtake, which his Weakneſs may lead him into, and to which by how much the leſs apt he is to think highly of himſelf, he will always be by ſo much the more expoſed. But what Senſe is there in ſaying, that a Man is *Juſtified* by *believing* that he is *juſtified?* To me the Thing is utterly incomprehenſible. For if God hath made our *Juſtification* to depend upon any *Conditions*, as undoubtedly he has, theſe *Conditions* muſt be performed; and, conſequently, a Man muſt be *actually juſtified*, before he can in reaſon *believe* that he is *juſtified*; upon which foot it is plain, that this *Belief* cannot be the *Cauſe*, but the *Effect* or *Conſequent* of *Juſtification*. And if a Man be ſo unreaſonable as to believe, that he hath performed theſe Conditions, when he hath not performed them, 'tis monſtrous to imagine, that ſuch an unreaſonable Belief ſhall *juſtify* him. It would be no hard matter

ter to purſue this Point more at large; but I think it would be an Abuſe of my Reader's Patience, to dwell upon a Miſtake which is in itſelf too groſs not to be taken notice of. I ſhall, therefore, add Two general Obſervations from the whole, and with theſe put an end to this Diſcourſe.

§. XXII. And, *Firſt*, from what has been ſaid, we may be able to give a clear and ſatisfactory Anſwer to a Queſtion which has cauſed much Trouble to ſome Divines, *viz.* What is the *Difference* between that *Faith* which *juſtifies*, and that *Faith* which doth *not* juſtify. For if the Meaning of this Queſtion be this, What is the Difference between that Faith which *alone* juſtifies, and that which *alone* doth not juſtify? the Anſwer is obvious, That there is juſt the ſame Difference between the one and the other, as there is between a Thing which *is*, and a Thing which is *not*; for there is, as has been ſhewn, no *Faith* which *alone* juſtifies. But if the Meaning of the Queſtion be, What is the Difference between that Faith which *leads to* or *effects Obedience* (for this upon the preſent foot is the only Senſe in which *Faith* can be ſaid to *juſtify*) and that *Faith* which doth *not*? I anſwer, That there is no *eſſential* Difference between them. For *Faith* is a *firm* and *undoubted Aſſent* to the *Goſpel Revelation*, which, therefore, muſt be ſuppoſed in every one that is ſaid to believe; Now, *Aſſent* is a ſimple Act of the Mind, and admits of no other Difference, than what relates to its *Permanency* or Conſtancy of *Continuance*; and in this Circumſtance it is, that the *Faith* which works *Obedience*, differs from that which doth *not*. The one is ready at hand upon all Occaſions, and both reminds us of our Duty and of our everlaſting Intereſt, when we have moſt need to be awakened into a juſt Senſe of them. The other is flitting and uncertain; hovers about

us in our easy and pleasant Hours, but is driven away when once the Storm of Temptation ariseth. Now this Difference being founded in the State or Disposition of the *Will*, by which the Mind applies itself, more or less, attentively to consider the Object of our Faith; we may from hence, *Secondly*, discover the Vanity of our modern *Enthusiasts*, who will sometimes ascribe a *Saving Faith*, or a *Saving Knowledge*, to such a Power as is proper to affect the *Understanding* only. Thus, for instance; some will tell us, That *(o) without an effectual powerful Work of the Holy Spirit, creating, and, by his Almighty Power, inducing, a New saving Light into the Minds of Men, they are not able to discern, receive, understand*, or *believe savingly, Spiritual Truths*, or *cannot receive Spiritual Things in a Spiritual Manner*. Others, That *(p) no Man can spiritually or savingly understand and believe the Truths of the Gospel, without an inward immediate Revelation of the Spirit, shining in upon the Heart, and inlightening and opening the Understanding*. And yet, at the same Time, these Men will grant, that a Man may *literally, speculatively*, and *historically* understand and believe these Things, without the help of this *New Light* or *Revelation*, (whatever it be) even by a proper use of his natural Faculties. Now this is such gross and palpable Nonsense, that were it not for the Pomp of Words with which it is disguised, it must be obvious to the most ordinary Understanding. For if by understanding the Truths of the Gospel *literally*,

(o) See Dr. *Clagett* Introd. to Par. 1.

(p) *Barclay* Apol. Prop. 2.

ſpeculatively, and *hiſtorically*, they mean underſtanding and believing them as they really are, but not reducing them to Practice (which is the only ſound Senſe, that can be put upon theſe Words) 'tis ridiculous to ſay, that a Man may do this without a *New Light* or *Revelation*, and yet at the ſame Time, to pretend, that he wants this *New Light* to enable him to believe or underſtand them *ſavingly*. For, when once a Man rightly apprehends, and firmly believes the Truths of the Goſpel, the *Underſtanding* has done all, that it is proper and poſſible for it to do; And if after this he does not underſtand, or believe them *ſpiritually* and *ſavingly*, the Fault lies wholly in the *Will*, which doth not apply itſelf to conſider of, and to conform itſelf to, what the *Underſtanding* judges to be fit and reaſonable. To ſpeak Senſe, therefore, it ſhould be ſaid either, 1. That no Man can underſtand or believe the Truths of the Goſpel *at all*, without this *New Light* or *Revelation*: Or, 2. If they grant, that a Man may underſtand or believe theſe Things, and only alledge, that he cannot do it *ſavingly*, the Caſe ſuppoſed ſhould be, not that he wants any *New Light* or *Revelation* (for this is proper only to affect the *Underſtanding*, which is ſuppoſed already to be ſufficiently informed) but, that he wants ſome Aſſiſtance of another ſort (diſtinct from mere *natural Abilities*) which is proper to influence the *Executive Powers*. This latter is true, but then it doth not ſuit with their Purpoſe; For the great Uſe which they make of this Principle, is, not to reform Mens Practices, but to impoſe upon their Underſtandings; It is not to ſhew what is neceſſary to make them act conſiſtently with their Faith, but to lead them to believe, as *they* believe, in contradiction to the cleareſt Evidences of Common Senſe and Reaſon. Do but under-

dertake to argue againſt their Principles, and they will anſwer your Objections by telling you, they are *carnal Reaſoning*. "And when they have run "themſelves upon manifeſt Abſurdities, they will "come off by pretending, that theſe are Myſte- "ries not to be underſtood without the *Illumination* "of the *Spirit*, and, therefore, *Natural Men*, as "you are, cannot underſtand them. 'Tis true, they "make Uſe of Scripture very often, and pretend, "that they believe nothing, but what they are "able to prove from thence; but then, if you "make it never ſo plain, that they argue weakly, "and alledge Scripture impertinently, this will "not ſerve your Turn; for you will be told, That "you have not as yet received, that *new ſaving* "*Light* which can only make you underſtand Spi- "ritual Things Spiritually." Thus they deceive the Ignorant and Unwary! But how could they deceive, if they would ſpeak ſo as to be underſtood? Should they take upon them to ſay abſolutely, That though the Scriptures are a Compleat and Perfect Revelation of God's Will, yet they are not to be underſtood and believed without another Revelation; who would believe them? or how could they believe themſelves? Again, ſhould they ſay, That after a Man, by the Uſe of the Scriptures, has got a right Faith, he cannot live a Holy and a Chriſtian *Life*, without a *new Light* or *Revelation*; the Impertinency of the Aſſertion, with reſpect to ſuch as want to be ſatisfied about the Truth of their Doctrines, would be as viſible as the Falſhood of it. One way, therefore, was only left, *viz.* To turn the Whole into a moſt Sublime and Myſterious Piece of Nonſenſe, and thereby to ſeem to ſay ſomething, when in Truth they ſay nothing at all. But they do not more impoſe upon others, than (if they be in earneſt) they have impoſed upon themſelves.

ſelves. And the great Misfortune is, that when once Men have habituated themſelves to this way of Thinking, or rather *Talking*, they have intirely removed themſelves out of the reach of Conviction. For when once a Man comes to have renounced his Reaſon, which is the Caſe of all who flee to this *New Light*, 'tis ridiculous to ſuppoſe, that there is any good to be done with him in the Way of Reaſon.

DISCOURSE III.

CONCERNING

GOSPEL HOLINESS;

OR

SANCTIFICATION.

§. I. * WITH the foregoing Points concerning *Regeneration* and *Juſtification*, that concerning SANCTIFICATION has a very cloſe Connexion. That *Holineſs* is an indiſpenſible Condition of Salvation, no Man can deny; and for this Reaſon, one would hope it ſhould be no hard matter to underſtand what it is; † But ſome Men will tell us, That it is, "in the Nature of it, *abſtruſe* and "*myſterious*, *undiſcernable to the Eye of carnal* "*Reaſon*;" and under this Pretence, ſeveral things have been advanced concerning it, not only falſe, but dangerous, "tending both to betray the Com-"fort of the Good, and (which is worſe) to hinder "the Repentance of the Wicked. I make no que-"ſtion, but that the Pure in Heart, know the ex-"cellent *Advantages* of Holineſs, better than the

* Par. 2. Chap. 6. Sect. 1. p. 241.

† †

" *Carnal Mind*, ſo continuing, can know them; " for Experience inſtructeth and convinceth more " effectually than dry Argument. And I believe, " no Man can deſcribe the *Joys* of the *Holy Ghoſt* " in that manner, that one who is *alienated from* " *the Life of God*, may thereby attain ſuch an un- " derſtanding of them, as the Godly Man has, by " the Senſe and Feeling of them." But as to the *Nature* of Holineſs, I am far from believing it to be a hard matter, to make even a wicked Man underſtand what it is, as I now hope to ſhew in a very few Words.

P. 243. §. II. The Word *Holineſs*, is diverſely made uſe of, both by Sacred and Profane Writers. Sometimes it ſignifies a bare *Relation*, whereby thoſe *Perſons* and *Things* are ſaid to be *holy*, which are devoted to ſome Religious Uſe; at other times, it imports ſome particular *Actions* or *Qualities*, proper to intelligent and rational Beings. Now it is in this latter Senſe, in which we are to underſtand the Word *Holineſs*, in this Diſpute; for we are inquiring, What that *Holineſs* is, by which one Chriſtian is diſtinguiſhed from another? Whereas in the former Senſe, the Term is applicable to all Chriſtians in general; for all Chriſtians are, by their Profeſſion, dedicated to God, and in this Senſe, conſequently, are all holy. * This being premiſed, I ſay, in general, That the Word *Holineſs*, denotes ſuch a *Behaviour*, as is *ſuitable* to a *Reaſonable Creature*. Now foraſmuch as this *Suitableneſs* of *Behaviour*, hath reference to ſome *Law*, which a *Reaſonable Creature*, as ſuch, is ſuppoſed to be under, and ſince the *Law*, which every *Chriſtian* is under, is the *Goſpel Law*, or the *Law* of *Jeſus Chriſt*; the living in conformity to *this* Law, muſt therefore be what is meant by *Goſpel Holineſs*, or the *Holineſs* of a *Chriſtian*; i. e. it is ſuch a *regularity* and *fitneſs* of *Behaviour*, as

as the *Gospel* directs and engages us to. This is so plainly the Notion of *Gospel Holiness*, that it would be an idle, and a foolish thing, to go about to prove it, and in this there is nothing, but what is very easy to be understood. † But some, not satisfied with this plain and easy Notion, have, indeed, made it, "a very *abstruse* and *mysterious*, and, to "say the Truth, an *unintelligible* Thing," as you will easily grant, I suppose, when once you come to hear, what they have said about it. Now there are two ways, by which the Notion of *Holiness*, has been corrupted, *viz.* "1. By *adding* something "to its *Nature*, which doth *not* belong to it;" and, 2. By *taking away* from it that which *does*. To each of these Particulars, I shall, therefore, say something, as briefly as I can.

† p. 247

§. III. As to the former of these ways, by which the Notion of *Holiness* has been corrupted, we are told, "1. That it must be *the Fruit of electing* "*Love*, i. e. of a Man's being *absolutely* elected to "eternal Salvation:" * Which, were it true, seems very impertinently offer'd, in order to explain what Holiness is. For I am never the nearer, understanding the *Nature* of Holiness, by being told, that the *Elect* only are, or can be Holy. If, indeed, a Man's being *elected*, could be considered as a *part* of Holiness, this would go some way towards shewing what it means. † But this is impossible: For the *Antecedent Cause*, cannot *enter* into the Notion of any thing which *Election* must necessarily be, with respect to Holiness, if Holiness be (as they say it is) the *Fruit* of *Election*. To say, that a Man's being *elected*, is an *essential part* of Holiness, is in other Words to say, "That if a Man *not* elected, "attains to the *same Vertue* and *Piety* which is in "one of the *Elect*, it is *not* Holiness in the *former*, "though it *is so* in the *latter*." * Now this is placing

* p. 266.

† p. 262.

* p. 267.

cing Holineſs, in *part*, at leaſt, not upon the inherent Qualifications of Men, but in the Decree of God, concerning their future Condition; which is juſt as good Senſe, as if in the Definition of the Nature of *Loyalty*, you ſhould include the *Favour* of the *Prince*, and ſay, that if a Subject be never ſo faithful in his Service, and zealous for his Honour, yet he is not *loyal*, unleſs he has the Aſſurance of a *Poſt* of a Thouſand Pounds a Year. It were a low Taſk, to expoſe Men merely for talking out of the Way; but the Notion is dangerous, as well as abſurd. For, next to the actual Enjoyment of God, in a Life to come, our greateſt Happineſs conſiſts in having comfortable Expectations of it in this; and theſe muſt always bear a Proportion to the Aſſurance we have of our having attained to that *Holineſs, without which no Man ſhall ſee the Lord* †. But what Comfort can a good Man find from ſuch Principles as theſe? Let us ſuppoſe him to be careful to pleaſe God in every Inſtance of his Duty; that he *hath eſcaped the Pollutions that are in the World, thro' the Knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*; in a Word, let us ſuppoſe him (ſo far as human Frailty will allow) to be every way perfect; yet all this is not *Holineſs*, unleſs, alſo he be of the Number of the *Elect*. And how ſhall he know, that he is *elected?* By the Integrity of his *Obedience?* Not ſo; for this is often found, for a Time at leaſt, even in thoſe who are *not* elected. There is therefore (ſo far as I can perceive) no way left, but God's *inſpiring* into a Man the Knowledge of his *Election*; And what is this, but to make "a *new* Revelation ne- "ceſſary to the Comfort of good Men;" * which if any Man has ſo much Senſe, as not to expect, there is plainly no Comfort for him, or if he weakly believes, that God doth ordinarily vouchſafe Revelations of this ſort, he may eaſily be impoſed upon, by the *Deluſions* of his own *Imagination* (as too many,

† p. 267, 268.

*

I fear, have been) and ſo *fancy* himſelf to be an *holy Perſon*, when, indeed, he is in the very *Bond of Iniquity* †. This Notion therefore, not only deſtroys the Comfort of good Men, but hinders (as I ſaid) the Repentance of the Wicked: * And this is the Natural Conſequence of the Doctrine of *abſolute Election*, under what View ſoever you conſider it. But having, as I hope, effectually overthrown this Foundation, in my Treatiſe concerning the *Holy Spirit's Operation*, there will be the leſs need for me to take any farther Pains to remove this Superſtructure. For, plain it is, that if Men are not *abſolutely Elected* to Salvation, their being thus *Elected*, cannot be *Holineſs* or any Part of it †. Wherefore, † *

§. IV. Secondly, I proceed to another Notion, which is, that Holineſs muſt be an *infuſed Habit*, * which I could readily agree to, might I have the Liberty of explaining the Phraſe. But as you have ſeen under the Head of *Regeneration*, by theſe *infuſed Habits*, they do not mean a regular *Bent* or *Diſpoſition* of Mind to Vertue, wrought in us (indefinitely) by the *Holy* Spirit of God, (which indeed, is that which conſtitutes the Nature of Holineſs) but certain Qualities, put into the Soul all at once by an Almighty Operation. Now this I ſay, That whereſoever there is in the Mind a due Conformity to the Law of the Goſpel, there is true *Holineſs*, whether there be any ſuch *Habits* as thoſe Men ſpeak of, or whether there be none †. But it is a very ſtrong Preſumption, that there are no ſuch *Habits*, becauſe the Scripture ſpeaks not one Word about them; and it is very certain, that *Holineſs* doth not *conſiſt* in ſuch *Habits* as theſe, becauſe the Scripture *commandeth* us to be *holy*, which would be a ſtrange ſort of Precept, if *Holineſs* were ſomething which is *infuſed* into us by an *Almighty Operation* of the Spirit. I ſay, farther, p. 261, to 266. * †

that

that where there is a due Conformity of Mind to the Law of the Gospel, there is *Holiness*, whether this Conformity hath been wrought by *Care* and *Exercise*, or whether it hath been effected (which rarely, if ever, happens) *all at once*. For the *Manner* in which a Thing is done, does not alter the Nature of it; and what can be more absurd than to imagine, "That if *one* Man should by *Patience* "*in well-doing*, gradually arrive to a good Disposition, which is suddenly infused into *another* "by the Miraculous Power of God; the *former* is "*not* holy, though the *latter is?* If there were "any need to confute so gross a Conceit as this; "it may be done by the following Instances: The "Apostles were by a *sudden Inspiration*, enabled to "speak divers Languages; but if another Man "should, by Study or Conversation, attain a like "Skill, the *Effect* is plainly the *same*, though the "*Causes* differ; the *Skill* is the *same*, though *in-*"*fused* into the former, but *acquired* by the lat-"ter. Again; When our Saviour turned *Water* "into *Wine*, he added nothing, by the Miraculous "Operation, to the *Nature* of Wine, which is still "the same, whether it be produced by a *Miracle*, "or by God's ordinary Blessing upon natural Cau-"ses." In like manner, Whether the "*good Dis-*"*position* we are speaking of, be *instantaneous* or "*gradual*," whether it comes by an *irresistible Power*, "or by the *Assistance* of the Spirit "*co-operating* with our Endeavours, the *Effect* is "still the same." And if it be *Holiness* in the one case; it must be *Holiness* in the other. Now the ill Consequences of this Notion are plainly the same with those of the Former: For, First, * If the having certain *Qualities* infused or put into the Soul by an *irresistible Power*, be essential to *Holiness*, † "It will be hard to offer a good Reason to any "Man

" Man that has a Mind to be excuſed, why he " ſhould endeavour " to be holy. " For, I under- " ſtand not what can be reaſonably ſaid to excite " a Man to endeavour after that, which it is im- " poſſible, in the very Nature of the Thing, to " obtain, by endeavouring. " * Now this is the Caſe, if this Doctrine be true; for though good *Habits* may, indeed, be acquired by Exerciſe, as that Phraſe ſignifies a prevailing Inclination to do the whole Will of God, yet, as it denotes *Supernatural Qualities*, infuſed by an *Almighty* Power, (which is the Senſe in which theſe Divines uſe it) 'tis plain, that it *cannot*, as any one muſt ſee, but thoſe who are not willing to underſtand †. Secondly, " This Perſuaſion is equally dangerous to " the Comfort of good Men, who cannot upon " this Ground be reaſonably ſatisfied of their own " good Eſtate. " * For how ſhall a Man know that he has theſe *infuſed Habits?* Either they are *ſenſible*, or they are *not*: If *not*, they can be known no otherwiſe, than by a *private Revelation*, and if they *are* ſenſible, they can be ſo no otherwiſe, than by their proper *Effects*, i. e. by ſome *ſudden* and *violent Change*, which is perceived in the Mind. But there are Thouſands and Ten Thouſands of good Men in the World, who never perceived any ſuch ſudden and violent Change in themſelves †; and the more conſtantly and early a Man has been trained up in Piety and Vertue, the leſs Senſible muſt he be of any ſuch Change; and if, after an ill Beginning, a Man has arrived to an habitual Practice of his Duty, yet if he hath done it in the Way of *Diligence* and *Induſtry* (which is moſt commonly, if not always, the Caſe) he has ſo much the leſs Reaſon to aſcribe it to a *ſudden*, irreſiſtible Operation. So far then, as I am able to judge, " the beſt Way that a Man can take to be " *ſure* that he is *holy*, is never to endeavour in the " leaſt

" leaſt to be ſo, but to live in an utter Neglect of
" all the Means of Grace, and to be altogether
" careleſs about mending his Life. For if, while
" he is in this State, he finds himſelf, all on a ſud-
" den, to be an *Habitual* good Man (as the *Elect*
" will ſometime or other) he may be ſure, that
" *Spiritual Life* is *infuſed* into him, and that he is
" therefore an *Holy* Man, becauſe his Good Habit
" could not be *acquired* by the Uſe of Means,
" ſince he uſed no Means, to obtain it. "

§. V. " This is the plain Conſequence of this
" Opinion, " which is alone ſufficient to overthrow it; Wherefore, I now proceed to the other way, by which, as I ſaid before, the Notion of *Holineſs* has been corrupted; and that is, by *taking* that *away* from the *Nature* of *Holineſs*, which does indeed belong to it. Now this they do when they * ſeparate from *Holineſs* both *Moral Vertue*, * and *Chriſtian Obedience*; which two things, why, and how far, I diſtinguiſh, the Reader will preſently
p. 247, † perceive. As to the firſt, they tell us plainly †,
248. That " *Holineſs differs eſſentially from all Moral*
" *Habits of our Minds, however acquired or im-*
" *proved*, and they will not allow *Moral Duties*,
" *whatſoever they be, to be any Part of Goſpel Obe-*
" *dience.* " Now, to ſhew the Falſhood of this Aſſertion, it will be proper, in the firſt Place, to ſtate the true Notion of *Moral Vertue*, and then to compare it with the Notion of *Holineſs*, as above deſcribed; for by doing this, we ſhall be able clearly to ſee what Difference there is between
p. 249, them. In general, then, *Moral Vertue* ſignifies,
250. " *A prevailing Inclination of the Mind, to thoſe*
" *Manners, or to that Way of Life, which is beſt*
" *for a Reaſonable Creature.* It is called *Vertue*,
" becauſe the proper *Strength*, *Force* and *Vigour*
" of a reaſonable Creature, conſiſts in his Good-
" neſs,

" nefs, *i. e.* in a Temper of Mind, and Courfe " of Life, agreeable to right Reafon. For, we do " then exert that *Fortitude*, which is proper " to the Excellency of our Nature, when the Man " governs the Beaft; *i. e.* when Luft and all Bo- " dily Paffion is fubdued to the Law of our Mind. " It is called *Moral*, becaufe it is converfant " about the *Manners*, *i. e.* the Cuftomary Dif- " pofitions and Actions of Reafonable Crea- " tures as fuch; in Oppofition to *Corporeal* " or *Phyfical*." Which expreffeth that *Power* or *Energy* in *Natural Bodies*, " by which God governs " the reft of his Works. But there is befides this, " another Senfe of the Word *Moral*, and that is, " When it is oppofed to *Pofitive*. In this Senfe " *Laws* are faid to be *Moral*, which are of *Natural* " and *Perpetual* Obligation; as, That *God is to be* " *obeyed in all that he requires*; That we are to *do* " *unto all Men as we would be done unto*; and the " like; * and thofe are faid to be *Pofitive*, which * we are bound to, not by any *intrinfic* Goodnefs that there is in the Things commanded, but mere- ly by the arbitrary Will and Impofition of the Law-giver; of which fort were all the *Ceremonial* Laws amongft the *Jews*, and are the Inftitutions of *Baptifm* and the *Lord's Supper* now amongft us. Agreeably to this Limitation of the Word *Moral*, with refpect to *Laws*, Cuftom has obtained to li- mit the fame Word when applied to *Human Actions:* That is, as thofe *Laws* only are faid to be *Moral* which are of *Eternal* and *Perpetual* Obli- gation; fo, in like manner, thofe *Actions* only which are done in conformity to fuch Laws, are faid to be *Moral Vertues*. Thus by a *Moral Man*, we commonly mean no more, than one who lives up to the Principles of *Natural Religion*, in contra- diftinction to thofe who obferve not only thefe *Na- tural Duties*, but alfo fuch *Pofitive Precepts* as are

en-

enjoined by *Divine Revelation*. Thus, I say, Custom has obtained; but to say the Truth, I think it a very improper way of Speaking. For though the Distinction between *Moral* and *Positive* may be allowed, with respect to *Laws*, yet this does not seem to afford any Foundation for a proportionable Distinction, with respect to the *Actions* of *Men* conversant about those *Laws*. That is, though you may *absolutely* confine the Notion of a *Moral Law*, to such Laws as are of *natural* and *perpetual* Obligation; you cannot *absolutely* confine the Notion of a *Moral Man*, to him who obeys such Laws *only*. The Reason is plain, *viz.* That upon supposition, that *Positive Laws* are enjoyned, Obedience to such Laws becomes a Part of *Morality*, as resulting from that general and universal Principle of Morality, which has just now been mentioned; to wit, That *God is to be obeyed in every Thing which he commands*. He therefore who refuses to obey even a *Positive* Law, is no *Moral Man*; but it is not worth contending about this. Let the Distinction be allowed, and the Matter will then be plainly thus, That *Moral Vertue* signifies either, 1st. A Conformity of Mind to the Duties of Religion both *Moral* and *Positive*; or, 2dly, A Conformity of Mind to such Duties only as are of *Eternal* Obligation.

p. 251, 252. † * §. VI. Thus much being premised concerning the Nature of *Moral Vertue*, we may now easily judge, how far it differs from *Gospel Holiness* †; and plain it is, that in the first and general Sense of Moral Vertue, there is no Difference between them. * For he that can distinguish between *a Conformity in Heart and Life to the Laws of Christ*, which is *Holiness*; and *a Conformity in Heart and Life to the Laws of* RIGHT REASON, which is *Moral*

Moral Vertue; must give up his Christianity, *i. e.* he must be obliged to say, That the Laws of *Christ*, and the Laws of *Right Reason*, are not the *same* Laws; or, in other Words, that Man is not bound, as a *Reasonable Creature*, to that Rule of Life which the Gospel proposes to him †. If the Phrase, *Moral Vertue*, be taken in the *Second* and more limitted Sense, then indeed it is true, that *Moral Vertue* and *Gospel-Holiness* are not the same; but even then the Difference will not be *essential*, as they say it is; for *Moral Vertue* will still be a *Part* of *Holiness*, because all the Duties of *Morality* are enjoyned by the *Gospel*, and no Man can be a *good Christian*, who is not a good *Moral Man*. I will add, That the *main* of *Gospel-Holiness* does consist in *Moral Vertue*; "For the Discharge of those Duties which are in their own Nature indispensible, is the most fundamental and most excellent Part of Religion, of primary Obligation, and the End of all other Religious Performances." And for this we can desire no better Authority than that of our Saviour himself, in whose account "the "*loving the Lord our God with all our Hearts, and* "*our Neighbour as ourselves, is the first and the* "*great Commandment.*"

† f

§. VII. * And now, though I think I have made it as plain as possible, that Moral Vertue, in one Sense, is a Part of Gospel Holiness; and in the other, one and the same Thing †; I will yet briefly take notice of those Objections, which have been alledged to shew the contrary; * The most principal of which is drawn from the *End* of Human Actions, *i. e.* from those *Reasons* or *Motives*, upon which Human Actions are performed. Now it is very certain, that the *Reasons* or *Motives* upon which a Man acts, are that which constitutes the *Formality*, both of *Moral Vertue* and of *Gospel Holiness*, and there-

* p. 256, to 259.

† *

there-

therefore, if these be *essentially* different, *Moral Vertue* and *Gospel Holiness* must be so too. But this
† is not the Case †; For the only Difference that is pretended, is, That in *Gospel Holiness* all Actions are performed, *with a special View, to the Glory of God in Jesus Christ*, which (say they) in *Moral Vertue* they are not. But this latter Part of the Assertion, is not universally true: The *Glory* of *God* in *Jesus Christ*, being, with respect to a *Christian*, an *End* as necessary to *Moral Vertue*, as it is to
* *Gospel Obedience.* * Our Actions are then directed to the *Glory* of *God*, when they are done in *Obedience* to his *Authority*, and out of a Sense, that it is our *Duty* so to do; for then it is that we shew our *Reverence*, *Gratitude*, and *Filial Love*, and, consequently, give *Glory* to God. We also *glorify* God, when we are led to Obedience by a Belief, that he will finally *Reward* us; for this is an Acknowledgment both of his *Goodness* and *Sovereign Power*. Finally, Our Actions are then directed to the Glory of God *in Jesus Christ*, when, to all these Considerations, we add those *special Motives*, which arise from the *Redemption* purchased for us by Jesus Christ. This is the only sound Sense that can be
† put upon this Phrase †; and who doth not see, that he who acts not upon these Principles, falls
* as much short of *Moral Vertue*, as he doth of *Gospel Holiness?* * *Reverence* and *Gratitude* to God, are undoubtedly *Moral Duties*, in which he is wanting, who doth not consider both the *general* and the
† *special* Motives he has to Obedience †. To *glorify God in Jesus Christ*, is, indeed, an *End* of Obedience, which Nature teaches not; but being once made known by Revelation, we are as much bound by the Principles of *Morality*, to regard this *End*, as we are those other *Ends* which *Reason* directs us to.
* * Further; If you consider *Moral Vertue* as it subsists in those who are *not* under the *Light* of the *Gospel*,

ſpel, the *End* will indeed *differ*, but not *eſſentially*; becauſe thoſe Motives upon which a Man in this Circumſtance obeys God's Laws, are not *ſet aſide*, but *inforced* by the *Goſpel*. A *Believer* has thoſe Motives to *Obedience*, which a Man under the *Law* of *Nature* only, has not; but then he wants none of thoſe which the other has. If a good Heathen follows the Rule of *Vertue*, in Obedience to the *Authority* of *God*, and in Vertue of thoſe Reaſons which ariſe from his *general Providence*, a good Chriſtian does the ſame; which brings the Matter to what I ſaid juſt now; to wit, That *Moral Vertue* differs in no Senſe from *Goſpel Holineſs*, any otherwiſe than as a *part* differs from the *whole*; for the good *Heathen* doth *in part*, that which the good *Chriſtian* doth, and he doth it too *in part* upon the *ſame Principles*.† As to the other Objections, they are taken from the *Efficient Cauſe*, which is ſuppoſed not to be the ſame in *Moral Vertue*, as in *Goſpel Holineſs*. But this muſt needs be an inconcluſive Way of Reaſoning, becauſe different Cauſes do oft-times produce Effects of the ſame kind. We may, however, juſt mention the Objections, which are theſe, *viz.* 1. "That "*Goſpel Holineſs* is wrought in us by the *eſpecial* "*Grace of God*, whereas *Moral Vertue* is a Thing "*in our own Power*; to which it is ſufficient to "anſwer, That *Moral Vertue* is not *in our own* "*Power*, but by the *Grace* of God. 2. They ſay, "That nothing can belong to the Nature of *Holi*"*neſs*, which is not *the peculiar Fruit of Chriſt's* "*Interceſſion*." * But I underſtand not what can be meant by being the *Fruit* of *Chriſt's Interceſſion*, unleſs it be, being the *Effect* of *the Spirit*, which is procured for us by Chriſt's *Interceſſion*, and then the Objection has already received its Anſwer, for indeed it is the ſame Objection over again.

† *

§. VIII. I think it not worth the while to tarry any longer upon this Subject, which, to those who understand what Notions these Divines have, of the *Nature* of *Moral Vertue*, may perhaps seem
† p. 249. to be a Contention merely about Words.† For so indeed it is, that they speak of *Moral Vertue*, as if it consisted in "nothing else, but the *(q)*
* "Decency of *outward Behaviour*;" *Which, were it true, I should be ready enough to allow, that *Moral Vertue* is not *Gospel Holiness*, nor any part of it; because an *outward Decency* of *Behaviour*, abstracted from the *internal Rectitude* of the *Will*, hath indeed nothing in it that is truly good, or
† praise-worthy †. But this, I may venture to say, is a Notion of *Vertue* peculiar to themselves;
' "much short of *Plato*'s, *Aristotle*'s, *Plutarch*'s, or "of any other Heathen Moralist who has written "well concerning Manners. Indeed there is no "one Thing, in the Notion whereof Men have "been more generally agreed, than in that of "*Moral Vertue*. What Variety soever there is "in their Expressions of it, they all concur in "this Sense, that it is (as I said before) a pre-"vailing Inclination of the Mind to those Man-"ners, or that Way of Life, which is best for a "Reasonable Creature; or an universal Goodness "of Manners, both in *Mind* and in *Practice*." To affirm, therefore, that *Moral Vertue* doth not belong to the *Nature* of *Holiness*, will, I doubt,

---

(q) Thus Dr. Owen, *and thus also Mr.* Turretin. Moralia quibusdam dicuntur (opera) quæ quoad externam Disciplinam, seu actum externum, quam *Substantiam* vulgò vocant talia sunt Loc. 17. Quæst. 4. §. 1. *And he gives us a very broad Hint, that this was his own Notion, by denying* universally, that the Vertues of the Heathens were good Works, for this Reason, because (as he pretends) they wanted the inward Obedience of the Heart.

found

found in the Ears of moſt Men, as if they might be good Chriſtians without the Vertues, even, of a good Heathen. * For which Reaſon (if there had been no other for it) it was proper to take this notice of it, and to ſhew the true Difference that is between them. But there is another Reaſon which made it ſtill more neceſſary; and that is, that when you have ſet them right in the Notion of *Moral Vertue*, it will ſtill be true according to their Principles, that it hath nothing to do with *Holineſs*. Put the Caſe, if you pleaſe, of one who believes in Chriſt, loves and fears God, and in conſequence hereof, yields a ſincere and hearty Obedience to the Laws of the Goſpel. This, I hope, is more than *outward Decency* of *Behaviour*. Now does ſuch a Behaviour as this belong to the *Nature* of *Holineſs*, or does it not? Why nō, it doth *not*, if what they ſay be true; for according to their Notions, *Holineſs* may ſubſiſt without it. You have already ſeen, that *Holineſs*, in their account, conſiſts in having certain *ſupernatural Habits* infuſed into the Soul, which *Habits*, as has afore been obſerved, are ſo far from implying a conſtant and regular Diſpoſition of the Mind to vertuous Actions, that they may ſubſiſt under a State of the moſt heinous and deliberate *Wickedneſs*. This is farther plain from what they teach concerning the Connexion there is between *Holineſs* and *Juſtification*, which they ſay (and very truly) cannot be ſeparated the one from the other. But how do they explain this? By denying that *actual Wickedneſs* is conſiſtent with a *juſtified State*? No ſuch Matter, they tell us plainly, that (r) a *wicked Man*, whilſt he is

(r) Licet fidelis juſtificatus in varia incidat peccata —— non ſequitur ſanctificationem ipſum divelli a juſtificatione; quia

ſuch, may be *juſtified*; yet, ſay they, he is *holy*, becauſe he hath remaining in him the *Habit* of Holineſs. They ſeparate *Holineſs*, therefore, from *Moral Vertue* in its *true* and *largeſt* Senſe, even when it becomes *Chriſtian Obedience*; and the bottom of the whole is this, that let a Man live never ſo *wickedly*, he may yet be a *holy* Man. A Notion which doth ſo much confound the common Uſe of Words, and ſo flatly contradict what the Holy Scriptures every where teach, that I † need not be at the pains to refute it. †

---

quia ſi ſanctificatio *actualis* tollatur non tamen *habitualis*—— qui peccat non ſancti agit, ſed poteſt tamen qui ſanctitatis *actum* non exeit habere ſanctitatis *habitum* in ſe manentem. *Id. ibid. Quæſt.* 1. §. 21.

DIS-

*DISCOURSE IV.

Of FERVENCY *in* PRAYER, *and of the* Work *of the* Spirit *in Relation to it.*

§. 1. THAT it is through the Assistance of the *Spirit*, that we are enabled to pray acceptably, is a Point universally acknowledged by all Christians, those only excepted, who throwing the Work of his Grace intirely out of their Divinity, resolve every Thing into the mere natural Abilities of Men. And the Thing in general is not to be denied; For since the Efficacy of our Prayers depends upon those *Vertuous Dispositions*, which are required as necessary to *prepare* and *qualify* us for the right Performance of this Duty, and since these *Dispositions*, whatever they be, are all of them the Effect of the Divine Grace, that we pray acceptably, must needs be referred to the *Spirit*, as to the *prime* and *principal* Cause. But this Account, I conceive, does not reach the whole of what is commonly intended. For when they speak of the Assistance of the Spirit *in Prayer*, most Men seem to mean, not that Influence of the Holy Ghost,

by which, in the *general Course* of our Lives, we are disposed to Vertue, but some *peculiar Act* or *Operation* upon the Soul, which the *Spirit* is supposed to exert at the very *Instant* of Prayer. This is most remarkably true of those who pretend, that the *Matter*, and even the very *Words* of our Prayers, must be of the *Spirit*'s inditing, which Conceit having been already refuted, there is no need for me to say any Thing to it here. But many, who do not run into this degree of Extravagancy, seem nevertheless to be of Opinion, that the Spirit does, by a *peculiar Act*, inspire into us that *Fervency* of *Mind*, in which the Life and Vigour of true Devotion doth consist. Now tho' this Notion hath nothing in it, which is in any wise unworthy of the Majesty of God, but carries with it rather a great Appearance of Piety; yet because it may be, and I am persuaded has been, the Occasion of dangerous Scruples in good Men, who have hereby been led to think a great deal worse of themselves, than they have deserved, I think it very proper to go to the Bottom of it, and see how much of it may be true, and how much is not so; And the Method which most readily offers itself to me, is this, *viz.* 1. To shew, What it is to pray *frequently*. 2. To inquire, *Whether* Fervency is necessary to render our Prayers acceptable; and what Degree of it will be sufficient. 3. To consider, How far we have reason to believe, that the *Spirit* excites us to *Fervency*, by any *Act* or *Operation* distinct from that Influence, which he vouchsafes in the ordinary Course of our Lives, to enable us to become good.

§. II. I begin with the first of these, What it is to pray *fervently*; and this is a Point which will require no long Discussion. For the Word *Fervency*, in its proper Original Import, signifies *Heat*

or

or *Warmth*, and when by a *Metaphor* it is applied to the *Mind*, denotes the *Briskneſs* or *Vehemency* of ſome of its *Paſſions*, which is very fitly and properly reſembled to the Heat of Natural Bodies. To pray with *Fervency*, therefore, implies neither more nor leſs, than to pray with *Earneſtneſs*, i. e. with a *vehement Deſire* of obtaining what we aſk for; which is a Thing ſo very plain and obvious, that 'tis ſurprizing to me, how any ſhould be ſo far impoſed upon, as to meaſure the *Fervency* either of their *own*, or of *others* Devotions, by what they *ſee* with their *Eyes*, or *hear* with their *Ears*; and that it ſhould be thought a Token of the *Spirit*, when a Man *ſighs* and *groans* out his Prayers, ſpeaks *loud* and *diſmal*, uſes *warm* and *paſſionate* Expreſſions, and wrings his Body into various and uncommon *Poſtures*. The Seat of *Prayer* is the *Heart*, and there alſo is the Seat of *Fervency*. Now the *Heart* may be very *cold*, when the *Tongue* is moſt *warm* and *affectionate*; The *Deſires* may be *low* and *groveling*, when the *Voice* is moſt *elevated*; and the Affections *indolent* and *unmoved*, when the *Body* is moſt of all in Motion. In ſhort, as theſe, and ſuch like Circumſtances, are often preſent where true Devotion is not; ſo they are as often wanting where it is; They are Things, which *Art* can eaſily effect, and which *Nature* does not always produce. But whereſoever they are, and whence-ſoever they proceed, they are, with reſpect to Prayer, purely *accidental*, and, therefore, indifferent, ſo that what St. *Paul* hath ſaid upon another Occaſion, is alſo applicable here; *Bodily Exerciſe profiteth little, for neither if we uſe it, are we the better, nor if we uſe it not, are we the worſe.* The ſame Thing may be ſaid of *Weeping*, which though in ſome it may be the uſual Concomitant of *inward Diſtreſs*, yet it is not ſo in *all*. For this depends in a great

measure upon *Constitution*, which is not in all Persons, nor in the same Person at all Times, disposed to be alike affected by the same degrees of Passion. As, therefore, we must not measure either the Greatness, or the Reality of any Worldly Sorrow, by the Number of our *Tears*, so neither must we, the Fervency of our Devotion; considering, that the Heart may swell and boil within, though the Sluices without be stopped up, and that Grief is not the less clamorous for being silent.

§. III. Thus much I thought it needful to observe, in order to guard against some common Mistakes. I now proceed to inquire, *Secondly*, Whether *Fervency* is necessary to render our Prayers acceptable; and what Degree of it will be sufficient. Now as to the first Branch of this Inquiry, *viz.* Whether *Fervency* be at all necessary; we cannot (I think) in the least doubt, which way it must be answered, when we consider those frequent Recommendations, which are given of it in Scripture. St. *Paul* desires the *Romans*, συναγωνίζεσθαι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς, that they would *strive or contend with him in their Prayers unto God*, Rom. xv. 30. Now we may be said to *strive* in Prayer, either with regard to one single Act of the Mind, or with regard to many. With regard to one single Act of the Mind, we may be said to *strive* in Prayer, when we desire a Thing with much *Passion* and *Earnestness*, or, which is all one, with *Fervency*; and thus our Translators have rendered the Phrase, *Colos.* iv. 12. Where we read of *Epaphras*, that he was ἀγωνιζόμενος ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς, *labouring fervently in Prayers*. With respect to many Acts of the Mind, we may be said to *strive* in Prayer, when we desire a Thing, not only with *Earnestness* or *Fervency*, but *frequently*, i. e. with much *Impor-*

Importunity. But though the Phraſe, in a rational Conſtruction, will bear this latter Interpretation, yet the Scripture Uſage limits it particularly to the former, as ſeems plain from the Place in the *Coloſſians* above-cited, where we may obſerve, that the *Importunity* of *Epaphras* is expreſſed by a diſtinct Term. He was not only ἀγωνιζόμενος, but he was πάνλοτε ἀγωνιζόμενος, where the ἀγωνιζόμενος, denotes the *Fervency*, and the πάνλοτε the *Frequency* of his Prayers, as it doth alſo *Luke* xviii. 1. In truth, *Frequency* in Prayer is every where deſcribed in the Sacred Writings, by the Phraſe of *praying always*, or ſome other Phraſe equivalent to it, as προσεύχεσθαι ἐν πάντι καιρῷ, ἀδιαλείπτως, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, and the like However this be, thus much is certain, that ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς, does at leaſt *imply* Fervency, or an *earneſt Deſire* of obtaining what we aſk for. For as a Man could not be ſaid ἀγωνίζεσθαι, to *combat*, or *contend* with another, who ſhould only lift up a Hand or a Finger, tho' he ſhould do it never ſo frequently; ſo let a Man offer up never ſo many Prayers to God, he cannot be ſaid ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ἀγωνίζεσθαι, to *ſtrive* or *contend* in Prayer, if he does it after a *cold*, *indifferent* Manner. The Word indeed carries with it the Idea of *Labour* and *Vehemency*; whence it is, that we ſay of thoſe who are under any Exceſs of *Pain* or *Sorrow*, that they are ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, *in an Agony*, becauſe of that *Labour* and *Conflict* which the Soul feels upon thoſe Occaſions. There are a Variety of other Words, by which the ſame Thing is expreſſed; ſuch as βοᾶν, to *cry aloud*, which is the property of thoſe who deſire to be heard; προσεύχεσθαι ἐκτενῶς, to pray *intenſely*, which in the old Teſtament is called, the *pouring out of the Heart*, the *ſeeking God with the whole Heart*, or *with the whole Deſire*. But it would be endleſs to mention Particulars, nor need we lay together the whole

Au-

Authority of Scripture, in a Caſe which is ſo plainly determined by the very Reaſon of the Thing. The Oppoſite to *Fervency*, is, as I juſt now hinted, *Coldneſs* and *Indifferency*; and ſurely, there can be little Reaſon for a Man to expect, that God ſhould be ready to liſten to thoſe Prayers, which he himſelf is under no concern whether he will hear or not. To be *indifferent* in Prayer, is a ſure Sign, that we are not under a juſt Senſe, how much it is for our Intereſt, to have God for our Friend, becauſe Men are naturally and unavoidably led to be ſollicitous after that which they judge to be of Conſequence to the Happineſs of their Condition. And whence can ſuch a Temper as this proceed, but either from a *careleſs Stupidity*, which makes us unaffected with that which moſt nearly concerns us, or (what is worſe) from a vain and wicked Conceit of our own *Self-ſufficiency*, which cauſes us to attribute both what we have, and what we hope for, *leſs* to the *Providence of God*, than to *ourſelves*. Take it under which View you pleaſe, and it will be plain, that a Perſon thus diſpoſed, is a very improper Object of the Divine Favour; He hath no Merit at preſent; He giveth no Encouragement, by the Proſpect of any good Uſe that he is like to make of it afterwards. The End which God propoſes in diſpenſing his Bleſſings, is, that he may lead us to Obedience. He ſupplies our Wants, that he may ingage *our Gratitude* by *his Beneficence*. But *Gratitude* always ſuppoſeth a *Senſe* of the *Benefit* received; and the *Return* on the one ſide can never be *great*, where the *Merit* on the other is conceived to be but *little*. It would be eaſy for me to inlarge upon this Subject; but I content my ſelf with theſe ſhort Hints, and ſhall only add, That what I now ſay, I would have underſtood of thoſe only, who are *habituated* to a *lazy*, *unaffectionate* manner of Praying. For,

as

as I am far from thinking, that every *wandring* in Devotion, implies so much Evil in its *Cause*, so I must not affirm it to be the same in its *Effects* and *Consequences*. The very best of Men do sometimes (and, God knows, too often) feel themselves interrupted in their most solemn Addresses; which arises not from any Slight that they put upon the Divine Favour, but from the *Weakness* of our common Nature, which will not permit us *constantly* to attend to those things with which *generally*, and *in the main*, we are most deeply affected. The *Pleasures*, the *Cares*, the *Business* of this Life, all of them claim one considerable Share of our Thoughts, and will surprize us now and then when they ought to be fartheſt from us. And therefore, let no Man be so rigid and severe with himself, nor think so hardly of God, as to conclude, upon every such Accident as this, that he wants the *Spirit*, and that he prays unworthily. For what we cannot help, God will certainly overlook, and the *Spirit* is given to *correct* our Infirmities indeed, but not to *extirpate* them. He makes us better *Men*, but he doth not change us from *Men* into *Angels*.

§. IV. Having shewn you in general, that *Fervency* is necessary to render our Prayers acceptable; I proceed, in the next Place, to consider what Degree of it will be sufficient: And here, not to descend to the lowest Degree of Sufficiency (which, perhaps, it may be a hard matter exactly to determine) I shall content myself with laying down this general Rule, *viz.* That *that* Degree of Earnestness will certainly be sufficient to render our Prayers acceptable, which is natural to the ordinary Temper and Disposition of a good Man, when he seriously considers of his own Wants; and

and that, therefore, we are not to infer, that we are deſtitute of the *Spirit*, becauſe we are not carried away with ſudden and violent *Raptures*, or becauſe our Prayers are not attended with an *Acceſſion* of *Vehemency* which we do not feel upon any other Occaſion. The Scripture has no where determined the exact Meaſure of Devotion; it no where tells us, that our Prayers will not be heard, unleſs our Minds be wrought up into *extraordinary* and *uncommon Emotions*; And what Reaſon can poſſibly be aſſigned, from the Nature of the Thing, to ſhew, that God will not be ready to anſwer the Requeſts of thoſe, who apply to him under a due Senſe of their own Wants, and of the Dependency they have upon him? Give me leave to add, That Prayer being a ſtanding and *ordinary* Duty, the *Eſſence* of it muſt therefore, be ſo defined, as that Men may be ordinarily *qualified* for the right Performance of it. But this they cannot be, upon Suppoſition that any *new* and *unuſual* Vehemency be of abſolute Neceſſity; For the *Deſire* is not ſo far under the Power of the *Will*, as that we can raiſe it higher when we pleaſe; eſpecially, when the Mind (as is now ſuppoſed) is already duly apprized of the Weight and Importance of the Thing deſired. *Ecſtacy* and *Tranſport*, has a very great Dependance upon the Bodily Diſpoſitions of Men, to the exciting whereof, ſome peculiar external Circumſtances may be neceſſary, which do not every Day occur; and conſequently, can never be certain, either as to all Perſons, or to the ſame Perſon at all Times, wherein it is yet very requiſite and fitting, that he ſhould pray. I am perſuaded, I ſay no more upon this Point, than what all Chriſtians do more or leſs find to be true, by their own Experience, which plainly enough ſhews, that an *Acceſſion* of *Vehemency*, beyond what is natural to the *ordinary* *Temper*

Temper and *Disposition* of a good Man, cannot be *essential* to *true Devotion.* But I will not go so far as to say, that *Devotion* is any thing at all the *worse* for it: I will not (as a certain * eminent Writer has done of late) give it as a *Prescription*, that Prayer *ought* to be *calm* and *undisturb'd*; because, I can very easily understand, that what is not *essential* to any thing, may yet contribute towards the *Perfection* of it; and because I verily believe, that with how much the more *Earnestness* (or, if you please, *Heat* and *Flame*) a Man offers up his Prayers, upon Supposition, that all other Circumstances are as they ought to be, they will be answered so much the more effectually. I have not in general so bad an Opinion of the *Passions* of the Soul, as to think that they are either evil in themselves, or that they must needs cast a Blot and a Stain, whensoever they mix themselves in our religious Performances: Nature hath implanted them in us, for great and excellent Ends, and if they are fix'd upon a proper Object, they do, in Proportion to the *Intenseness* wherewith they are exercised, both argue an excellent Disposition, and lead to noble Attainments. Thus, in the Case now before us, greater *Earnestness* in Prayer, argues a quicker *Sense* of our *Wants*, and stronger and more lively Apprehensions of the *All-sufficiency* of that God to whom we apply ourselves for Relief; which Disposition of Mind, the more perfect it is, it must be so much the more *attractive* of the Divine *Compassion*: Our *Devotion*, therefore, must be by so much the more *perfect*, by how much it is the more *ardent* and *affectionate*; yet still I say, that the *lowest* Degree of *Earnestness*, which is consistent with the Temper of a good

* Bp. of *Bangor.*

Man,

Man, ſhall be accepted, though not with *the ſame* Succeſs, yet with a Succeſs *proportionable* to its Worth and Excellency: and to ſay otherwiſe, is in Effect to ſay, that a Man may be a good Man, and yet not fit to pray, which is a Contradiction both to the Word of God, and to the common Senſe and Reaſon of Mankind.

§. V. This Foundation being laid, we need only to conſider, with what Degree of *Earneſtneſs* a Man ought *ordinarily* to deſire the Supply of his Needs, in order to know more particularly with what Degree of Earneſtneſs, it will be ſufficient for us to pray; and this Point will admit of a different Determination, according to the Diverſity of *Objects* about which our Deſires may be converſant: As Man is compounded of a *Soul* and a *Body*; his Wants muſt have a Relation to both, and ſince God is the Sovereign Diſpoſer of all good Things, both thoſe which relate to this Life, and thoſe which relate to a Life to come, 'tis plain, that the one as well as the other, ought to be the Subject of our Prayers. But then, ſince it is alſo plain, that the *Earneſtneſs* wherewith we deſire a thing, ſhould be in ſome Meaſure at leaſt *proportionable* to its *Value*, the Conſequence is, that we muſt not deſire *temporal* Things with the ſame Degree of Earneſtneſs, wherewith we deſire *Spiritual*, becauſe the *latter* are infinitely more valuable than the *former*. With reſpect therefore to our Deſire of *temporal* things, 'tis evident, that we may err in the Exceſs; and in general, I believe, it will be admitted as a true Rule, that by how much the *leſs* earneſt we are about them, by ſo much the more *perfect* will our Condition be. Not that we are to be *abſolutely indifferent* towards them, for this I take to be impoſſible; and the Scripture ſuppoſes ſome ſort of *Earneſtneſs*, when

it

it teaches us to *pray* for them. But forasmuch as we know not, whether these Things will be profitable or hurtful to us, this *Earnestness* must always be *moderated* with Submission to the Divine *Will*, whether he will grant them or *not*; and the *more* it is thus *moderated*, *i. e.* the more firmly and chearfully we repose ourselves upon his infinite Wisdom and Goodness, and the less we *lean to our own Understandings*, the more acceptable must we be in his Sight. And must not our *Earnestness* after *Spiritual* Things, be moderated also by a *Submission* to the *Divine Will?* I answer; Not *for this Reason*; Because we know not whether they will be *profitable* for us; for we are *sure* they *must* always be so; But then a great Difference must be made in this Case between Things *only Profitable*, and such as are *necessary* to qualify us for the Kingdom of Heaven. With respect to the latter, there is no room for this Distinction, because we are *sure* it is his *Will*, that all should be so qualified. But as to the *former*, since for wise Reasons he doth not bestow them to all alike, but in different *Degrees* and *Proportions* to different *Persons*, according to his *Good Will* and *Pleasure*, here also must be the same *Submission* to the *Will* of *God*, as with respect to *Temporal* Things. If I, who am already qualified for the Kingdom of Heaven, see another Man *better* qualified, *i. e.* under higher Degrees of *Improvement*, than my-self, I am not to infer, that God will enable me to attain to the same State of *Perfection*, if I labour after it. If I *desire* it, therefore, (as indeed I must, and ought to do) yet it must be under this Reserve, *If God in his Wisdom, shall see it proper* to grant it me. But the Case is not the same with respect to Things *necessary*; for these, I am sure, God is ready to *grant*; These, therefore, we cannot desire with too much *Importunity*. But the great Difficulty will be, to determine

mine what is *enough*, or to define what Degree of *Earneſtneſs* after Spiritual Things, is eſſentially neceſſary to the *Temper* or *Diſpoſition* of a good Man: Shall we ſay, that *Spiritual* Things ought to be deſired by ſo much the more earneſtly than *Temporal*, by how much they are of greater Value? I fear we muſt not. For then our Deſires after *temporal* Things muſt bear *no Proportion* to our Deſires after *Spiritual*, becauſe there is *no Proportion* between the Excellency of the *one*, and the Excellency of the *other*. But where is that Saint now upon Earth, in whom the Love of God, and of a Life to come, burns with ſo pure a Flame? Who is there, that does not find his beſt Deſires, allay'd by a conſiderable Intermixture of this World? Nay, who is there, that upon many Occaſions, does not find his Affections ſo much clogg'd with the Weight of Senſual Appetite, that it is with ſome Difficulty that he can caſt the Scale on the Side of Heaven? In Truth, to deſire *Spiritual* Things, with an Earneſtneſs juſtly *commenſurate* to their intrinſick *Value*, is impoſſible, ſo long as we are in this frail and mortal Eſtate; becauſe that *Spiritual Happineſs* which we look for in another World, which is the End and Completion of all Spiritual *Attainments*, is not diſtinctly and experimentally known to us. We know, indeed, that it ſhall be very great, yea, infinitely greater than the moſt refined Happineſs that this World affords; but *we walk by Faith, and not by Sight*: We have no *particular* and *ſenſible* Knowledge what it is, and therefore, cannot be proportionably ſo much affected with it, as we are by theſe *Earthly* Things which are near at Hand; which we ſee in all their Glory; which we taſte and feel without Abatement. My Way of Thinking, therefore, in this Caſe, is plainly this, That ſuch a Degree of Earneſtneſs after *Spiritual* Things, as, with the

Di-

Divine Grace and Bleſſing, is ſufficient to lead us to *Obedience* to the Will of God, is as much as is *ordinarily* and *neceſſarily* required from us; which I hope will not be diſputed; becauſe, if it be ſaid, that any higher Degree is neceſſary; it muſt alſo be ſaid, that *Obedience* to God's Will is not ſufficient to qualifie us for Salvation. The Kingdom of Heaven is propoſed to us only as a *Motive* to *Obedience*; wherefore, if our Deſires after this Kingdom, and the Things pertaining to it, be ſo great as effectually to lead us to the *keeping of God's Commandments*, this *Motive* has had its proper Effect; and, conſequently, any farther Degrees, though they muſt always contribute to the *Perfection* of Holineſs, cannot be of ſtrict and abſolute Neceſſity.

§. VI. Now, therefore, I think we may come to a full and plain Determination of the Point before us. For ſince, as has been ſhewn, that ſame Degree of *Earneſtneſs*, which is natural to the ordinary Temper and Diſpoſition of a good Man, will be ſufficient to render his Prayers acceptable, and ſince every good Man muſt be ſuppoſed to deſire *Temporal* Things under an intire Submiſſion to the Divine Will, and *Spiritual* Things with ſuch an *Earneſtneſs*, as will effectually lead him to *Obedience*; 'tis evident, that he, who, thus diſpoſed, ſhall addreſs himſelf to God by Prayer, muſt pray with a true and acceptable *Devotion*: So that the great Criterion by which we are to judge of our Prayers, is, *The general Courſe of our Behaviour*; which will thus far be a certain Rule to us, that if we find ourſelves able to overcome Sin, and follow after Righteouſneſs, we need not doubt but that thoſe Prayers which with Seriouſneſs and Affection we

have daily put up to the Throne of Grace, have found a gracious and a merciful Reception, and that the like Succeſs will always attend upon the like Endeavours. But if, on the other Hand, we feel ourſelves in no Condition to bear up againſt Temptation, but ready to yield and give way to the Force of every predominant Luſt, 'tis as plain, that our Deſires after Heaven, and Heavenly Things, want much of that *Warmth* and *Vigour*, which it is fitting and neceſſary for them to have, and, conſequently, that whatever uncommon *Emotions* we may ſuffer whilſt we are praying, they are the Effect of other Cauſes, and not of true *Devotion*. It is, therefore, abſurd to ſuppoſe of a truly good Man, that he may *want the Spirit* of *Prayer*, or that *Grace* of the *Spirit* by which he is enabled to pray with ſufficient *Fervency* of *Devotion*. Such a one, when he *prays*, i. e. when with Seriouſneſs and Attention of Mind, he offers up his Requeſts to God; cannot be *without* true *Devotion*, nor, conſequently, without that *Grace* of the *Spirit* which is *neceſſary* to true *Devotion*. I will beg leave to carry the *Point* ſomewhat farther; and to ſay, that an acceptable *Devotion* may ſubſiſt in thoſe who at preſent fall ſhort of that *Goodneſs* which is neceſſary to *qualify* them for the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*. For, *Prayer* is one of thoſe *means* by which we muſt obtain that *Grace* which *qualifies* us for the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*; which ſuppoſes, that we may be qualified to *pray* acceptably, *antecedently* to our being qualified for the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*. And, therefore, I cannot in the leaſt doubt, but that every Degree of *Earneſtneſs* in Prayer, is acceptable to God, which is proportionable to the Advancement which a Man makes, when once he has made a good Beginning, and is daily going forward

in

in the Way of Righteouſneſs. But this is a Point which I ſhall not any farther enter into; my main Buſineſs at preſent, being to adminiſter ſome Comfort to thoſe truly good, but weak Men; who though they have no wilful Miſcarriage to charge upon themſelves, are perpetually finding Fault with their *Prayers*, and filling themſelves with endleſs and tormenting Scruples leſt they ſhould not have *the Spirit*, becauſe (as I ſaid before) at the *Inſtant* of Devotion, they do not find themſelves *ſurprized* by *ſudden* and *unuſual Raptures*. A Man ſhould never queſtion the *Goodneſs* of his *Prayers*, at leaſt, 'till he knows how to queſtion the *Integrity* and *Uprightneſs* of his *Conduct*; If the *Matter* of them be but as it ought, the *Manner* of them can never be amiſs, ſo long as it proceeds from an *honeſt* and a *good Heart*, of which, methinks, it ſhould be enough to convince us, that we feel the good Effects of them in ourſelves. But though I am deſirous to remove all needleſs *Jealouſies* on the one Hand, I would by no means lay a Stumbling-Block in the way to any good *Improvements* on the other: And, therefore, let me once more obſerve, That as with reſpect to *Spiritual* Things, every *Degree* of *Earneſtneſs* (within thoſe Limitations above ſet down) will add to the *Perfection* of our *general Eſtate*; ſo it will alſo to the *Perfection* of our *Devotions*. If, therefore, by daily *Meditation*, by *Faſting* and *Self-denial*, or by any other means, we can quicken our Apprehenſions of the Excellency of a Life to come, and mortify our Affections more and more to this preſent World, we ſhould not neglect to make the beſt uſe we are able of thoſe Advantages. For, the *more earneſt* are our Deſires, the *greater* is our preſent *Diſtreſs*, and the *greater* our *Diſtreſs* is, the *more thankful* ſhall we be when our Wants

are relieved, which cannot fail of bringing down the moſt plentiful Supplies from that merciful Being, who is always compaſſionate to the Afflicted, and moſt liberally beſtows his Favours upon thoſe who will moſt thankfully receive them.

§. VII. One Point only now remains, which I hope will be diſpatched in a very few Words, and that is to conſider, *Thirdly*, How far we have Reaſon to believe, that the Spirit excites us to *Fervency* of *Devotion* by any Act or Operation *diſtinct* from that Influence which he vouchſafes in the ordinary Courſe of our Lives; concerning which Point, becauſe the Scriptures are wholly ſilent, *i. e.* no where make any direct or expreſs Mention of any ſuch Operation, we muſt, therefore, proceed with the more Caution in the Reſolution of it; and I think we ſhall not exceed our Meaſure, if we lay down the following Rules, *viz.* 1ſt, That as to that Degree of *Fervency* which is of *abſolute Neceſſity* to render our Prayers acceptable to God, this being at moſt no greater than what is *natural* to the *Ordinary Temper* and *Diſpoſition* of a good Man, we can have no Reaſon to aſcribe this to any *Act* or *Operation* which the *Spirit* vouchſafes us at the *Inſtant* of *Prayer*. For the *Spirit* is given for ſuch Ends and Purpoſes only as are *needful*, and it is plain, that no *new* Operation can be *needful* for the producing this Effect, becauſe the *Spirit* hath *already* prepared us for it, by leading us to Goodneſs. 2dly, As to thoſe *Tranſports*, which good Chriſtians may ſometimes feel in their *Devotions*, *above* what is *natural* to their *ordinary Diſpoſition*, I do not think that we are preſently to infer that even *theſe* are the Effect of any *new* Operation; and that becauſe

they

they may possibly be the Effect of other Causes. They may be excited by some sudden and natural Change in ourselves, or they may be occasion'd by some external accidental Circumstances, which work upon the Passions, and give us more lively Images and Apprehensions of Things; which is a Case, that, perhaps, may not rarely be observed by an Attentive Mind. But then, 3dly, I durst not take upon me to say, that the Holy *Spirit* doth *never* by any *new* or *distinct* Operation at the *Instant* of *Prayer*, excite us to greater Fervency, because the Possibility of its being the Effect of *other* Causes, doth not *exclude* this *one*, and because 'tis not unreasonable to suppose, that he may sometimes do it, though he hath no where particularly promised it. 'Tis very reasonable to believe, that the *Spirit* dispenses his Graces at such Times as Men are in the best Disposition to receive them; and, for ought that we can tell to the contrary, a *Holy Motion* may be able to make stronger and more lasting Impressions upon a Heart soften'd and made pliable by the *Warmth* of *Devotion*, than it could do under a *natural* and more *equal* Temperature. But in this, I will not venture to define peremptorily, because, I know not the Nature and Constitution of Man, nor the particular *Manner* of the *Spirit*'s Operations; and, after all, 'tis possible, that the *Spirit* may no otherwise excite us to greater Degrees of Fervency, than *antecedently*, by a general and *familiar* Improvement of those Christian Graces which are the original Source and Fountain of true Devotion. If any one should believe this, I see not what Reason he would have to think the worse of his Prayers; but if he believes, that the Spirit comes upon him by sudden and violent Snatches, let him take care, that his Belief does not degenerate into a

dan-

dangerous *Enthuſiaſm*; which is the Caſe when Men are led to deſpiſe all *Evenneſs* and *Sedateneſs* in Prayer, and, eſpecially, if, aſcribing all *Heat* in Devotion to a *Divine Impulſe*, they look upon it as a ſure Evidence and Token of the *Divine Will*, and are thereby led (which I fear has ſometimes happened) to purſue or engage themſelves in ſuch Methods, as otherwiſe, perhaps, they could not have conſented to without Reluctancy.

FINIS.

BOOKS Printed for JONAH BOWYER, *at the* Rose, *the West End of St.* Paul's Church-Yard.

A NEW Voyage to the *South-Sea*, and along the Coast of *Chili* and *Peru*, in the Years 1712, 1713, 1714. Particularly describing the Genius and Constitution of the Inhabitants, as well *Indians* as *Spaniards*, their Customs and Manners, their Natural History, Mines, Commodities, Traffick with *Europe*, &c. By Monsieur *Frezier*, Engineer in Ordinary to the *French* King.

Scripture vindicated from the Mis-Interpretations of the Lord Bishop of *Bangor*, in his Answer to the Dean of *Worcester*'s Visitation-Sermon concerning Church-Authority. By *Francis Hare*, D. D. Dean of *Worcester*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to his MAJESTY. pr. 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

Seventy two Sermons, and Discourses, on several Subjects and Occasions, in Six Volumes in *Octavo*, By *Robert South*, D. D. Canon of *Christ-Church*, *Oxon*, *&c.*

The Christian Faith explain'd and vindicated, and applied to Practice. In Twelve Sermons upon the Principal Festivals of the Church, preach'd at S. *James*'s Church, *Westminster*. By *Charles Hickman*, D. D. late Lord Bishop of *Derry*. In Two Volumes, *Octavo*.

An Appeal to the Word of God for the Terms of Christian Salvation: Or a Discourse proving, that Sincerity, exclusive of the Method of Religion

gion which a Man follows, is not ſufficient to entitle him to the Kingdom of Heaven. With a Preface, in which is contain'd a Reply to ſo much of the Lord Biſhop of *Bangor's* Anſwer to the Reverend the Dean of *Worceſter's* Sermon, and of his Poſtſcript in Anſwer to the Lord Biſhop of *Oxford*, as relates to this Subject. Price 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

The Unreaſonableneſs of attempting the Converſion of a Papiſt upon the Biſhop of *Bangor's* Principles, farther aſſerted; in Anſwer to *Sylvius's* Defence of a Dialogue between a Papiſt and a Proteſtant. With a Reply to ſome particular Objections. pr. 6. *d.*

A Rational Enquiry into the proper Methods of ſupporting Chriſtianity, ſo far as it concerns the Governors of the Church; being a Defence of the general Terms of Communion, as now eſtabliſh'd in the Church of *England*, with reſpect both to Clergy and Laity; in Oppoſition to the Principles of an univerſal Comprehenſion. Pr. 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

The Excellency of the Knowledge of *Chriſt Jeſus*. A Sermon Preach'd at the Pariſh-Church of *Redgrave* in *Suffolk*, on *Sunday February* the 26th. 1720-21.

In the Preſs, and will ſpeedily be publiſhed, The Second Edition of

The Young CHRISTIAN inſtructed, *&c.*

Theſe laſt Five by the Reverend Mr. *Henry Stebbing*, Rector of *Rickinghall*, in *Suffolk*.

237/83